

choice of individuals at an overall cost the Nation can reasonably afford, Congress should act to facilitate the prompt termination of involuntary inductions and a transition to an effective voluntary system for the procurement of military manpower."

Redesignate paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader. Does the leadership plan to adjourn now, at this point, or what is the plan?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is the plan to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, but it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] wishes the Senator from Oregon to yield to him briefly for a comment at this time.

Mr. PERCY. No, I will withhold that until tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert H. McBride, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

R. Peter Straus, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning William D. Abraham, to be second lieutenant, and ending Thomas A. Stevenson, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 28, 1967 (6AF).

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning William M. Gares, Jr., to be first lieutenant, and ending

Robert W. Worthing, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 1, 1967 (6A).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good: for His mercy endureth forever.—Psalm 106: 1.

O God of truth and love, who art worthy of a nobler praise than our lips can utter, and worthy of a greater love than our hearts can offer, in Thy presence we bow this moment as into Thy hands we commit our lives.

May the thoughts in our minds become channels for Thy goodness, may the noble dreams in our hearts find their fulfillment in Thee and may the work of our hands be honest and true. Together may we build a greater Nation and a better world upon the foundations of the faith of our fathers and our faith in the possibility of a new day.

Open our eyes to the manifestations of Thy spirit in our world. Give us courage in weakness, steady us when we would fall, enlarge our sympathies that we may become brothers to all the sons of men. Make us a people grateful for our privileges, faithful in our stewardship, and sensitive to the need of our countrymen. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6950) entitled "An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 223. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 449. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 477. An act for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepon;

S. 645. An act to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture;

S. 1136. An act to amend section 9 of the Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1190. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of surviving spouses; and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. STENNIS to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, May 10 to 14, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT'S BURDEN OF UNFAIR CRITICISM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Johnson for the dignity with which he has faced outrageous and hateful abuse from the critics of his Vietnam policies.

I daresay that no American President—including F.D.R. and perhaps even Lincoln—has been so vilified by his critics as has President Johnson.

The President, I believe, can take comfort in the fact that the worst invectives have traditionally been reserved for our greatest Presidents—leaders who topple the status quo or who pursue goals with the courage of their convictions, in spite of enormous counterpressures.

This administration is doing what it believes to be right, both at home and abroad. And I want the record to show that there has been no suppression of individual rights, no pressure brought to bear to curb freedom of speech, no obstacle put in the way of anyone desiring to speak their mind on Vietnam or anything else.

Free speech—no matter how irresponsible—has never been as unrestricted or as uninhibited as it is today.

Those who doubt this statement are cordially invited to read some of the signs held by pickets in front of the White House. Or, perhaps, they might want to attend the off-Broadway production of "MacBird."

I relish the freedom that our society provides for those wishing to dissent from Government policy. But I strongly de-

plore the abuse of this freedom demonstrated by those who savagely attack Mr. Johnson's patriotism, integrity, and honor.

The right to speak out does not necessarily include the right to be taken seriously. That right must be earned. Our Nation is involved in great issues of war and peace that demand the best from us, the most reasonable judgments and the most careful thought.

In this regard, I wish that the President's scattergun critics would emulate the man they are attacking.

Editorial reaction against vilification of our President has been most heartening. I think it is obvious that the overwhelming majority of the American people are fed up with the irresponsible tactics of a minority of dissenters. I include at this point in the RECORD a representative sampling of these editorials:

[From the Wyoming Eagle, Apr. 27, 1967]
THE RIGHT TO PROTEST

The right of dissent is inherent in our democratic form of government. Everyone has the right to his own opinion—and the right to express it.

It must be recognized always, that there are two sides to every controversial question.

The Constitution of the United States also guarantees the right of people "peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances"—the right of peaceable protest, if you will.

We, and most other Americans, most certainly would defend those rights.

But we believe some of the recent demonstrations, in protest against our role in the Vietnam war, have gone far beyond the limits of decent dissent—even in this freest of free nations.

Pulitzer prize-winning reporter Merriman Smith, veteran United Press International White House correspondent, said the other day that President Johnson has had to bear "some of the worst vilification—even obscenity—that I've seen or heard" in 25 years of covering the White House.

"At the so-called peace demonstration in New York's Central park the other day," he said, "there were grown men carrying signs which openly and plainly challenged the President's normalcy—mentally and sexually."

Smith expressed dismay at buttons which say "Lee Harvey Oswald, where are you now that we need you" and pamphlets and books which allege that President Johnson engineered the death of President Kennedy.

"This is not enlightened social change, or legitimate dissent or revolution. It is anarchy, born of a highly permissive atmosphere in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands," he said.

When the protestors defend their right to protest, we say: "Sure, go ahead. But keep your protests peaceable—within the limits of common sense."

When protestors complain that critics would deny them the right to protest, we say:

"Nuts! Even as you have the right to protest and demonstrate, we have the right, and perhaps the duty, to protest against your actions—particularly when those actions include attempts to keep top American officials from speaking, when those actions include burning the American flag, when those actions lead to rioting in the streets, and when those actions include scurrilous vilification of the President of the United States."

By way of criticizing such actions, we would say they are stupid at best, vicious and un-American at worst.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Apr. 27, 1967]

"FREEDOM" VERSUS FREEDOM

Reporter Merriman Smith of United Press International is the dean of all White House correspondents, a respected member of his profession, a Pulitzer prize-winner and a man who is sick and tired of all the "slimy" abuse heaped on national leaders, the President in particular.

Smith calls it anarchy in an atmosphere "in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands."

This may explain why the vulgar and vicious attacks are without parallel in American history; the atmosphere itself is unparalleled.

To Truman, Dewey was the cute little man on the wedding cake. And the fact that Truman came from a state noted for its jackasses was put to good use by his opposition.

Stevenson and Eisenhower were egghead and applehead, respectively, depending on which side was doing the talking. It was "give 'em hell" politics, to be sure, but few of the remarks came without a twinkle and a trace of a smile.

Contrast this with the current button asking, "Lee Harvey Oswald, where are you now?" And with the harangues that paint the President as a murderer of young men, leading the country to be a great purveyor of violence and deceit.

It has an entirely different ring to it—a sick, demented, rotten ring. And, unfortunately, it may be just one symptom among many that the country suffers from acute moral anemia.

Reporter Smith calls the malady an overdose of permissiveness. And he urges the American public to take some responsibility for its own image and stop blaming everything on either Lyndon Johnson or Drew Pearson."

That sense of responsibility can be encouraged by parents in the terms they use in front of their children to describe national leaders, those in positions of authority in general and other fellow citizens.

The treatment should by all means include religious institutions, for here is where the dream of true freedom was born. When Voltaire said, I disapprove of what you say, but "I will defend to the death your right to say it," he was speaking in a larger context—under the canopy of a higher law.

This is the law that counsels, in many languages and variations, Do unto others. . . The Golden Rule is the only proved preservative for other law.

It is apparent now that massive transfusions of this great law are needed to arrest the cancer of permissive anemia. Or else for true freedom, the disease could be terminal.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Apr. 26, 1967]
CHICAGO TRIBUNE DEPLORES "VILIFICATION" OF JOHNSON

The Chicago Tribune, in its lead editorial, said Tuesday President Johnson "does not deserve the assaults he has been getting from the peaceniks, the 'black power' crowd, the liberal intellectuals, and other assorted fanatics."

The editorial, titled "The Vilification of the President," said, "the recent wave of vicious personal attacks on President Johnson and other government leaders was discussed yesterday by Merriman Smith, the respected White House correspondent for United Press International, at a meeting of editors and publishers in New York."

"He said the President 'these days is the object of some of the worst vilification—even obscenity—that I've seen or heard in more than 25 years on the White House assignment'."

The editorial continued:

"Mr. Smith cited some of the obscene signs carried in the recent 'peace' demonstrations in New York, the signs and songs that President Johnson is deliberately burning Asian babies with napalm, and the pamphlets and other material alleging that President Johnson engineered the death of President Kennedy."

"This is not enlightened social change or legitimate dissent or revolution," said the correspondent. "It is anarchy, born of a highly permissive atmosphere in this country; a strangely paradoxical, pejorative atmosphere in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands."

"All presidents have been subjected to cruel jokes, unjustified ridicule, and falsification, some of which has been instigated by political opponents. The personal attacks on President Hoover will always be a black mark against the Democrats who made them. But the vilification of President Johnson is not based on political opposition; much of it seems to have no motivation, unless, as Mr. Smith suggests, the purpose is to tear down public confidence in authority at any level. This is the road to anarchy."

"The Tribune shares Mr. Smith's anger and disgust at the personal attacks on the President. As our readers know, this newspaper has vigorously criticized many of his policies, but we recognize the difficulties of his job and the efforts he has been making to do his best. He does not deserve the assaults he has been getting from the peaceniks, the 'black power' crowd, the liberal intellectuals, and other assorted fanatics."

"Mr. Smith noted that the press has a special reason for being concerned about the attacks on government leaders."

"Hate and vilification warp judgment just as heat buckles steel beams," he said. "If you tear down confidence in established authority, then those in public office blame a lot of this on the newspapers for reporting it. They say we are not doing enough reporting in depth; then when we do burrow beneath the government's bright public face of fresh handouts and self-serving background conferences not for attribution, they yell at us again for distorting their purpose of trying to second-guess Dean Rusk."

"So what do we have? An effort to destroy confidence in government plus an effort to pull down confidence in the press. Then, if both efforts are successful, whom do you believe, Dr. Spock?"

"Mr. Johnson—in fact no president—deserves the indignities being heaped upon him these days in the name of peace or civil rights. Criticism and challenge have their rightful place in our political system, but not the scrawls from restroom walls."

"Correspondent Smith closed his speech with the following comment:

"LBJ is in for much more punishment at the hands of the name-callers unless the squares who raise kids, mow the lawns, and pay their taxes decide to involve themselves by getting off their patios and telling the dirty-mouths to shut the hell up."

[From the San Antonio Express, Apr. 30, 1967]

VILIFICATION IS SELF-DEFEATING

The president of the United States is the target of the most vicious attacks in the history of the nation.

We do not refer to those who dissent with his domestic and foreign policies nor those who oppose the war in Southeast Asia per se.

Our form of government is open, and even requires contrary opinions in order to function as intended.

We do refer, however, to a nationwide campaign of slander, whispers, innuendo and vilification in outhouse-wall terms. One hears it on the streets, sees it on lapel pins and bumper stickers, and on picket lines.

Many of the signs, for instance, carried in peace demonstrations in Central Park in New York recently were such obscene attacks on Lyndon Johnson that the wire services would not transmit the photographs.

It is more than an attack on a president and an individual. It is a campaign calculated to undermine the very foundations of the government itself.

Every city has local ordinances that cover public filth. They should be enforced to the fullest. But a greater problem lies in the minds of those who have enjoyed smirks and sniggers at gutter slashes at the most powerful office in the world.

They think they are helping destroy Lyndon Johnson, the man. In truth, however, they are helping erode our form of government. It is immorality in its highest form and is self-defeating.

LBJ, the man, can handle himself; the life of the presidency lies in the hearts and minds of all of us.

THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have just been granted unanimous consent to address the House on Monday, May 15, on the 19th anniversary of that little but great State of Israel. I invite all other Members who are interested to join in that special order on Monday next.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION LAW

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1966, Public Law 89-487 was signed into law. Its purpose is to clarify and protect the right of the public to Government information and is to become effective on July 4 of this year. The 1-year delay was provided to permit the agencies ample time to adjust their practices to conform with the requirements of the law. To facilitate the process, the Justice Department has been developing guidelines for the use of the various departments and agencies of Government in complying with the law.

While the guidelines have not been

made public yet, there are disturbing rumors that some agencies are resisting the changed requirements. In an article by George Lardner, Jr., appearing in the Washington Post, the Food and Drug Administration's Bureau of Medicine and the Justice Department's Immigration and Naturalization Service are specifically cited. Mr. Lardner's article reflects a concern of members of the press that the nine exemptions the law provides "might be turned into sweeping rigid new excuses for the same old practices."

As a member of the House Committee on Government Operations—the committee which reported the bill—and as one who worked for its passage, I shall follow the implementation of the legislation with the closest scrutiny. Any attempt to rewrite or circumvent the intent of the law by administrative action would be unwise. If the fears reported by Mr. Lardner are realized, I am confident that those responsible will not be lacking in opportunities to explain their acts to the Congress.

The text of the article of May 8, 1967, follows:

U.S. DRAFTS GUIDELINES ON INFORMATION LAW

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Scores of Government information officers gathered informally at the YWCA last month for a Justice Department briefing on an unprecedented new law intended to end the suppression of Government records on official whim.

Most in the audience had no more than a remote idea of what was in the new "freedom of information" law although it was passed almost a year ago with a delayed effective date to give them time to get used to it. Many were clearly apprehensive at the message that the old excuses for refusing to give out information would no longer wash.

Assistant Attorney General Frank M. Wozencraft, head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, told them they had little time left to change their habits. The law goes into effect July 4.

To assist in the transition, Wozencraft—whose predecessor called the bill unconstitutional—has been working on a lengthy set of Government-wide guidelines.

The Administration had opposed the bill's passage, but Wozencraft and his assistants appear to be making a genuine effort to win the bureaucracy's acceptance of the principle that every American has the basic right to examine his Government's records.

Still in preliminary form and subject to further change, the guidelines begin with the notification that on July 4, "every executive agency must begin meeting in spirit as well as practice the obligations of the Public Information Act enacted by Congress last year."

The new law, the memo adds, requires:

"That disclosure be the general rule, not the exception.

"That all individuals have equal rights of access.

"That the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it.

"That individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the courts."

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Up to now, the law has permitted Government agencies, from top officials down to office clerks, to withhold any records where secrecy is considered "in the public interest" or required "for good cause." There was no recourse to the courts.

In approving the new law, the Senate Judiciary Committee pointed out that information has often been withheld simply "to cover up embarrassing mistakes or irregularities." The House Committee on Government Operations said "improper denials occur again and again."

The new law applies to every agency and organizational unit in the executive branch, presumably even the CIA—to whatever minuscule extent its secrecy might not be protected by other laws—and the nine across-the-board exemptions set out in the law.

Not a few agencies are expected to resist the changes, however. Reports, apparently reliable but impossible to document, have been received on Capitol Hill that officials in the Food and Drug Administration's Bureau of Medicine have been advised to get in the habit of putting as little on paper as possible.

Enthusiasm for the new law outside the Government, moreover, has been somewhat tempered by fears that the nine exemptions might be turned into sweepingly rigid new excuses for the same old practices.

The nine exemptions cover a broad spectrum, from national defense and foreign policy secrets covered by Executive order to various inter-agency and intra-agency memos and letters.

On this score, the Justice Department's own Immigration and Naturalization Service published a set of proposed regulations under the new law this past week that seem to conflict with the advice that Wozencraft has been enunciating.

Wozencraft has been publicly stressing the theme that the exemptions are "permissive," not mandatory, and that requests for records should be judged on their merits, not automatically rejected because the documents fall under one of the exemptions. Spokesmen for the House Government Information Subcommittee headed by Rep. John E. Moss (D-Calif.) have been pressing this view.

The Immigration Service, however, flatly proposes that any documents exempt under the new law "will not be made available."

The guidelines are being developed in what amounts to negotiations with the Moss Subcommittee. Restrictive advice in an early draft—such as a remark that records in use are not to be "snatched from agency employees"—has been dropped and replaced by a suggestion that a copy can always be made "with reasonable promptness."

SUGGESTS READING ROOMS

Wozencraft also has suggested that all agencies set aside reading rooms where the newly public records can be made available.

A spokesman for the Moss Subcommittee said disputes over the new disclosure law will inevitably have to be resolved by the courts. But so far, he said, the guidelines seem to be "on the plus side" for disclosure.

Except at this point, for the "freedom of information" guidelines themselves, the still preliminary draft copies have been tightly restricted and selected newsmen have been promised a peek, when Justice is ready, on a "confidential" basis only.

Meanwhile, a Justice Department spokesman tersely told The Washington Post, which obtained a draft copy: "We have no comment. Wozencraft has no comment."

DAIRY IMPORT ACT OF 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am

concerned about the problem the dairy farmers of my area, and of the State of New York, have in making a living. Because they are receiving such a low return on their investment—plus they have to spend long hours on the job, 7 days a week—many are leaving the dairy farms. And unless something is done, and this trend is reversed, the result could be a shortage of milk in this country.

Today I introduced the Dairy Import Act of 1967. This bill limits imports to the average butterfat and nonfat milk solids shipped into this country from 1961 through 1965. Also, these quotas can be increased if necessary, in the national interest, and they will increase in the same ratio as the domestic market grows.

Foreign shippers would continue to sell dairy products to this country, but effective quotas would be in force. As it stands now, quotas are ineffective.

Because these quotas are not effective, the dairy farmers of my area are faced with increasing competition from foreign products. We want to encourage trade with other nations. We want to move toward a more trade-minded policy where economic benefits are likely to be diffused over a large number of people. We need to prove to the world's underdeveloped countries that we accept them as equal trading partners. But the dairy farmers need some protection.

In a State such as New York, the dairy industry is an important segment of our economy. Dairy farmers in New York sell \$481 million worth of milk each year, the second highest total in the country. And dairying ranks first in total farm income in the State.

New York agriculture is big business. Four out of every 10 people working owe their employment, at least indirectly, to agriculture. Actually the production and selling of milk is New York's largest single industry. It accounts for a billion dollars of commerce each year in the State.

There are some 33,000 dairy farms in the State, producing about 5 billion quarts of milk each year.

But these 33,000 farmers are not the only ones who should be concerned about the problems in the dairy industry.

In addition to the milk business being big business, milk and dairy products are the largest portion of our diet. While we can buy manufactured dairy items from importers, fluid milk and fresh dairy products can only come from our dairy farms here in this country.

The future of our dairy industry affects not only farmers, but every consumer as well.

To encourage American dairy farmers of continuing markets, where they can receive reasonable prices for their milk, it has become necessary to place some sort of reasonable quotas on imported dairy products.

The President has called on the U.S. Tariff Commission to hold hearings on May 15 to determine if new quotas are needed. If the Commission recommends new quotas, and it is believed that it will, this will restrict dairy product imports.

However, in the past, such action un-

der section 22 has provided only temporary relief.

Mr. Speaker, what the dairy farmers want is a permanent bill and they are united in support of the Dairy Import Act of 1967.

RODNEY HUNT CO. WINS "E" CITATION

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great pleasure recently to participate in a ceremony in which the Commerce Department's coveted "E" award was presented to the Rodney Hunt Co., of Orange, Mass.

The ceremony was an historic one, beyond simply the significance it has for those of us concerned with business and commerce in the First Congressional District and, indeed, all of Massachusetts. It was the first time a ceremony of this kind was ever held in the Senate, this being in a Senate reception room, and I was pleased to participate jointly in the ceremony with my very able and distinguished colleague from the other body, Senator Edward M. Kennedy.

The "E" award is one in which we all take great pride, of course. It is given in recognition of outstanding contribution to the export expansion program. And, as we all know, expansion of exports is a vital ingredient in both our political and economic foreign policies. It is one of the means by which we seek to remedy our long-standing balance-of-payments problem, and a very effective means by which we can perhaps lower the barriers between East and West and thereby lessen the tensions that have for two decades kept civilization at or near the brink of destruction.

I am personally very proud that Rodney Hunt has won the award, although for those of us to whom the imaginative, bold, and aggressive management policies of Rodney Hunt Co. are a familiar story, the award comes as no surprise. The firm has been in the very forefront for years, both in innovation and efficiency of production, and in employee and community relations.

These policies have paid off in a significant increase in exports in recent years. A vigorous sales program, based on the tradition of direct customer contact, plus significant new innovations in integrated communications programs to reach overseas clientele have opened significant new markets. As a result of an extensive travel, and territorial exploration program, the company now has major installations in more than 50 countries including Vietnam, Soviet Union, Pakistan, Egypt, Cuba, and Australia.

The Rodney Hunt Co. is among the oldest and proudest in the country. It was founded in 1840 to produce the equipment and machinery needed by the

then developing textile industry that was for so many generations the very backbone of our New England economy. The firm continues to prosper today, in spite of the fact that much of our textile industry has migrated from New England to other areas where labor and operating costs are lower.

Specifically, the firm produces textile wet finishing machinery and sluice gates, these being its principal world market commodity. For domestic markets, it also manufactures industrial rolls for the paper, plastics, and textile industries. The company also produces more than 3,000 types and combinations of sluice gates for use in power, flood control, water purification, and the all-important area of sewage and pollution control systems. These, too, have found world markets.

The company pioneered in the development of continuous bleaching ranges for fabric processing in rope and open width form. Rodney Hunt bleaching and dyeing machinery is used by leading textile mills throughout the world.

Certainly, I am very proud and pleased indeed to offer my personal congratulations and best wishes to Rodney Hunt President Earl Harris, and to the approximately 350 employees who have made their firm one of the Nation's best.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to make note of the fact that today, May 10, 1967, is the 90th anniversary of the independence of modern Rumania.

The Rumanian nation achieved its official independence on this day in 1877, permanently breaking away from control of the Turkish Sultan. Its independence was achieved under Charles I, the first king of modern Rumania and its independence lasted until 1947 when the legal ruler, King Michael, was forced into exile by the Communists. The illegal Soviet-imposed government has held the Rumanian people captive for the last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the Communist designs to control the world manifest themselves in all continents, although our main attention at the moment is in Vietnam where direct Communist military aggression is taking place. However, we recognize that true peace and freedom will not come to the world unless Communist aggression is completely halted. We look forward to the day when all the captive peoples, including the brave Rumanian nation, will be able to enjoy a government of their own choosing in conformance with their history and culture and legitimate national aspirations.

We must take practical steps on behalf of the oppressed people of Rumania.

Neither the Voice of America nor Radio Free Europe is doing an effective job of broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain. Both are preaching the coexistence line of the present administration.

The Voice of America programming to Eastern Europe and, therefore, to Rumania has been especially weak since there is the obvious policy of the Johnson administration to appease Communist dictators of Eastern Europe rather than to use our own excellent facilities to deliver a message of truth.

Radio Free Europe, which has been coerced into an almost neutral type of presentation in recent years should be encouraged to augment strong broadcasts into Rumania with messages that have practical and direct bearing on current events.

BEEF IMPORTS AND THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, livestock farmers throughout the country are disturbed by the prospects of a continued falling off in beef cattle prices. Heavy supplies of low-cost beef and veal are flooding the American market.

In the first quarter of this year, choice steers on the Chicago market averaged \$24.95 per hundredweight—\$3 less than a year ago. In fact, beef prices have been falling almost continuously for the past year. The present farm parity ratio of 74 has not been equaled since the depression of the 1930's and the Department of Agriculture is currently forecasting a further decline of 5 percent in realized net farm income this year. Farm production costs, farm mortgages, and farmers' short-term debts are at an alltime high.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that the answer to the distress of agriculture lies wholly within the livestock sector of the farm economy. But livestock and livestock products are big contributors to total farm income; in 1966 livestock and its products accounted for more than half, and meat animals for more than a third, of total farm marketings. There is little doubt that livestock producers held a critical position in the farm economy.

What is the current outlook for cattlemen this year? The Department of Agriculture notes that there were 3 percent more cattle on feed on April 1 than a year earlier, and that marketings in this second quarter will be increased 4 percent over a year ago. For the remainder of 1967, there seems to be no relief for livestock producers. Domestic supplies will continue to be heavy, costs will continue high, and as far as we can see, beef imports will continue to pour in from Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Mexico, Canada, and other low-cost areas.

I shall not go into great detail at this

time on the beef-import situation. This has been done by well-qualified Members of this body over the past 2 weeks. For those who missed it, I would suggest a reading of the discussion of the problem by 13 of our distinguished colleagues on April 27, here on the floor of the House.

For the present I would point out that, according to the Department of Agriculture, imports of beef, veal, and mutton in 1966 were 18 percent above 1965. Total imports are as high, or higher, than they were 3 and 4 years ago, when their volume nearly ruined the domestic industry, and the Congress attempted to curb them by enacting the Meat Import Act of 1964.

You will remember that the administration was extremely unsympathetic to that act. In order to get any legislation at all, the Congress was forced to accept a base period for the setting of quotas which resulted in a quota that was entirely too high. Moreover, Public Law 88-482 contained two provisions which almost guaranteed the present high volume of imports. First, it provided for a too-generous quota increase based on the growth of domestic marketings. Second, projected imports were allowed to exceed quotas by 10 percent before such restrictions could become operative.

Another shortcoming of the 1964 act was the provision which required the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate in advance the level of imports in determining whether they would exceed the quota. Early last year, it should be remembered, the Secretary estimated that 700 million pounds of beef and veal would be imported. He continued to revise that figure upward, but somehow his estimate never matched actual imports of more than 823 million pounds.

So it is with this background of failure that a number of our colleagues have introduced legislation to amend Public Law 88-482 to effectively limit imports of low-cost foreign beef, and insure domestic producers of a measure of security. I want to take this opportunity to assure sponsors of this proposal of my support, by introducing a bill to amend the 1964 act.

The proposal of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE]—among others—appears to me to answer the shortcomings of the 1964 act. Briefly, it would do six things:

First, it would eliminate the 10-percent overrun of quotas I mentioned;

Second, it would provide that the quotas be set by the law itself, rather than by an estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture;

Third, it would use the years 1958-62 in establishing quotas, rather than the present system which includes 1963—the highest year on record for beef imports;

Fourth, it would impose quotas on a quarterly—rather than a yearly—basis;

Fifth, it would allow the administration to impose quotas on other meat products, such as canned and cured beef, fresh lamb and pork; and

Sixth, it would require that offshore purchase of meat by our Department of Defense be charged against the applicable quota.

Mr. Speaker, when the 1964 Meat Import Act was passed, there were those among the membership of the House who warned that it was an inadequate measure. We now have the proof of their foresight. We have an opportunity and an obligation to correct this measure. Let us act—and quickly—to provide our livestock farmers with the protection they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the text of my bill:

H.R. 9839

A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the policy of the Congress that the aggregate quantity of the articles specified in items 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat) and 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs)) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which may be imported into the United States in any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1967, should not exceed 585,500,000 pounds; except that this quantity shall be increased or decreased for any calendar year by the same percentage that estimated average annual domestic production of these articles in that calendar year and the two preceding calendar years increases or decreases in comparison with the average annual domestic commercial production of these articles during the years 1958 through 1962, inclusive.

(b) Before the beginning of each calendar year after 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate and publish the aggregate quantity prescribed for such calendar year by subsection (a).

(c) (1) The President shall by proclamation limit the total quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during each quarter of any calendar year to one-fourth the aggregate quantity estimated for such calendar year by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) The Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate the total quantity proclaimed under paragraph (1), and any increase in such quantity pursuant to subsection (d), among supplying countries on the basis of the shares such countries supplied to the United States market during a representative period of the articles described in subsection (a), except that due account may be given to special factors which have affected or may affect the trade in such articles. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify such allocations to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (c), or increase the total quantity proclaimed under such subsection, if he determines and proclaims that—

(1) such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, giving special weight to the importance to the Nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

(2) the supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

(3) trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act ensure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

Any such suspension shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount, as the President determines and proclaims to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be necessary to prevent circumvention of the purposes of this section.

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President determines that the imposition of quotas on the quantity of any article enumerated in subpart B of part 2 of schedule 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (relating to meats other than bird meat), other than the articles enumerated in items 106.10 and 106.20, is necessary in order to prevent unwarranted increases in the quantity of such article imported into the United States, he is authorized—

(1) to determine the total quantity of such article which may be imported into the United States during such period or periods as he may specify, and

(2) to limit, by proclamation, the total quantity of such article which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during such period or periods to the total quantity so determined.

(b) The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (a) and may increase or decrease the total quantity proclaimed with respect to any article under such subsection.

SEC. 3. Prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture an estimate of the quantity in pounds of meat to be accepted for delivery during such quarter, procured from appropriated funds by the Defense Department from foreign sources, of any of the articles with respect to which quantitative limitations have been imposed on imports under the provisions hereof. The quotas established pursuant to section 1 or section 2 hereof shall be diminished by the amount of such meat to be accepted for delivery as estimated by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 4. All determinations by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act shall be final.

SEC. 5. Effective January 1, 1968, section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the free importation of certain wild animals, and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products," approved August 22, 1964 (Public Law 88-482), is repealed.

URBAN HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PERCY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of his introduction of the National Home Ownership Act, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, of Illinois, discussed the bill and the general problems of housing in urban areas before the Washington Urban League. As a co-sponsor of this legislation here in the House, I would like to include the Senator's remarks in the RECORD for the attention of all Members and Senators.

Senator Percy's initiative and vision in developing this proposal deserves the gratitude of us all. He has shown us a way to end our reliance on outdated and uninspiring programs that have failed to solve the critical housing problem. I hope this bill will command strong support in both Houses, on both sides of the aisle.

The address follows:

URBAN HOUSING: A NEW INITIATIVE

(Address by Senator Charles H. Percy, Republican, of Illinois, before the Washington Urban League, Apr. 19, 1967)

"Even the blindest of us now knows the danger signals are flashing. Our cities are in crisis."

Thus begins the 1966 annual report of the National Urban League. And unhappily, there is little reason today to believe that the situation will show dramatic improvement in 1967.

A dreary recital of the problems of the cities would serve no purpose for this audience. For 57 years the National Urban League has fought to focus public attention on the developing plight of our cities and, in particular, of the minority groups in their burgeoning slums and ghettos.

Today I think it is safe to say that the goal of spotlighting the needs of our cities has been achieved. That is the essential beginning, and the Urban League can take a large share of the credit for it.

But unfortunately, the achievement of this beginning is only an infinitesimal part of achieving the ultimate goal—a satisfying urban environment where every person has the fullest opportunity to develop his innate human potential, and to pursue happiness unburdened by the chains of ignorance, poverty, exploitation and discrimination.

"Among all those problems to which we must address ourselves," continues your annual report, "the most critical is housing." Since I have long had a deep concern in this area, and since I have been chosen to serve on the Senate's Housing Subcommittee, I would like to discuss that particular problem with you this evening.

Before doing so, however, I would offer this observation: While it is convenient to discuss the problem of housing as such, we must never forget that housing exists to serve the needs of people. Any program or plan which fails to begin with that simple but too-often ignored fact is doomed to failure.

This has unhappily befallen the two principal Federal programs historically designed to fight the battle against slums—urban renewal and public housing.

In the concluding chapter of his book, *The Federal Bulldozer*, Professor Martin Anderson arrives at these conclusions about urban renewal:

"The federal urban renewal program," writes Dr. Anderson, "has made it more difficult for low and middle-income groups to obtain housing because of the amount of low rent housing it has destroyed."

"Urban renewal helps upper income groups and a few elite groups. It hurts low income people, especially those from minority groups." "Over 60 percent of the people forced to move are either Negroes, Puerto Ricans, or members of other minority groups."

Far from eliminating slums and preventing the spread of blight, "it is likely that urban renewal simply shifts slums and thus encourages the spread of slums and blight."

While one does not need to agree 100% with Professor Anderson's views, it seems to me inescapable that urban renewal, as a method of saving cities and improving the lives of city people, has fallen so far short of those goals that some better way must be found to achieve them.

Public housing has suffered much the same fate. Senator Robert Kennedy, certainly no enemy of government action, had this to say about public housing in his splendid testimony before the Ribicoff subcommittee last August:

"Public housing was once thought of as the answer to the problems of slums . . . Our housing projects were built largely without either reference or relevance to the underlying problems of poverty, unemployment, social disorganization, and alienation

which caused people to need assistance in the first place. . . Too many of the projects, as a result, became jungles—places of despair and danger for their residents, and for the cities they were designed to save."

It is easy, looking backward, to criticize those who, two or three decades ago, launched what was then a bold and imaginative effort to strike at the heart of urban problems.

It is difficult today to devise a way of moving toward those same elusive goals they so bravely pursued.

The important thing is that we take full cognizance of the thirty years of experience we have gained. And the lesson of those years is indisputably clear: housing and the physical environment must be dealt with as they relate to human beings and human needs.

Having emphasized that, and bearing it always in mind, let me turn to the specific problem of housing.

If the housing needs of today's slum dwellers are to be effectively met, we must find a way to bridge the credit gap.

Hard data is difficult to come by, but I am sure that any of you who have worked in the housing field instinctively know that mortgage financing and home improvement loans can be desperately hard to obtain in areas that lenders regard as a slum.

I have in my files a letter from one of the ablest and most socially conscious bank officials in Chicago: In it he says:

"It is often stated that most financial institutions stay away from declining areas, and such is generally the case. Probably a majority of housing in such areas is sold at inflated and unrealistic prices to minority groups on a contract basis with little downpayment. Lack of a down payment and undue credit risks make the conventional mortgage a rarity for low or middle income people in decaying or slum areas. Often when there is a downpayment, the property is overburdened with first, second, and even third mortgages, leaving no cash flow for a rehabilitation loan."

The result of this sort of credit gap, which widens whenever the mortgage market is tight, is the further deterioration of the ghetto. If our urban ghettos are going to be revitalized as decent, attractive communities—and they must be—some way must be found to bring more credit in on reasonable terms to do the job.

Fifty years ago farmers in downstate Illinois suffered from a credit gap very similar to the credit gap in Chicago's slums today.

The small country banks could finance plows and wagons, but lacked the resources to make long-term credit available for land and equipment.

The large city banks had the resources, but lacked the familiarity with rural areas and were reluctant to make loans far from their home office.

That credit gap was bridged by what was then a daring new concept—the Federal land bank system. Today, in the 50th year of the land bank system, a broad array of lending institutions exist to serve the specific needs of the American farmer.

The initiative came from action by the Federal government. But the responsibility was left, ultimately, with the farmer-borrowers themselves. As a result, the entire Federal land bank system authorized in 1917 passed into full private ownership in 1947. When the government had played its part in the difficult early phases, it stepped aside to let the farmers themselves take over.

What we need today is a mechanism to bridge the credit gap in our urban slums—a new lending institution tailored to the specific conditions and needs of slums and gray areas, and sympathetic to the needs of their people.

Tomorrow in the United States Senate I intend to introduce legislation to create just such an institution.

Last fall I advanced the idea of creating

a private, nonprofit institution combining a loan fund and a technical assistance service. This institution would support construction or rehabilitation programs to provide decent housing for sale to families who, though poor at the beginning, had the capacity to rise, given the opportunity and motivation, to the point where they could successfully carry a low-cost mortgage.

I spoke in terms of outright sale to poor families because I believed then—and believe even more strongly now—that home ownership can be a powerful force for motivating them to invest in themselves—to rise through their efforts to economic security. In addition, home ownership gives that feeling of roots, of dignity, of self-esteem that a poor man can scarcely get as the perpetual victim of the slumlord or the public housing management. It promotes responsibility, stability, respect for property, good maintenance, and many other habits which contribute to the creation of wholesome, attractive neighborhoods and aspiring communities.

The bill I intend to join in sponsoring tomorrow represents a tremendous improvement over the first version advanced last fall. There is, of course, much room for further refinement. That is the purpose of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, and I know that the accumulated know-how of my colleagues of both parties will find many ways to make it a better bill.

Let me give you a preview of its contents. Basically, the bill would charter a private, nonprofit National Home Ownership Foundation, consisting of two major components: a loan fund to help local sponsoring organizations overcome the credit gap; and a technical assistance service, to help them acquire the expertise to plan and execute a successful program for making home ownership available to aspiring families who could not on their own, get credit from conventional local sources.

Before a poor man could qualify for home ownership, of course, he would have to exhibit the earning capacity for carrying a mortgage. This might mean six months to a year of education, job training, and credit counseling assistance before he and his family could qualify. The realistic prospect of home ownership, I am convinced, can provide the crucial impetus for low income families to embark on this path—even if they have been slapped down time and time again when they sought to take charge of their lives.

The local sponsoring organizations would have to spring from the people themselves—they would not be superimposed from above by well meaning people in Washington or elsewhere. They might be nonprofit housing associations or cooperatives or limited dividend corporations. The Washington Urban League might be a sponsor. But whatever form the sponsoring organization might take, it would have to be based upon the people to be served and command their allegiance and personal involvement.

The \$64 dollar question, of course, is how can the housing produced, whether single family, cooperative, or condominium, be made available at a cost a lower income family—say in the \$3500-\$6000 range—can afford? Won't this require a government subsidy, given today's housing costs?

Well, I for one am hopeful that ways can be found to cut deeply into the costs of housing rehabilitation. The Department of Housing and Urban Development and several of the large building materials suppliers are hard at work on this problem. But barring a breakthrough of unexpected proportions there will probably have to be some government aid to make home ownership a meaningful possibility for low income families.

The assistance plan we finally developed is deceptively straightforward. It would work something like this:

Here is a local sponsoring organization with

houses or apartments ready to sell. Perhaps it is the Washington Urban League. There is a waiting list of families seeking homes, and they have over a period of time demonstrated their qualifications for home ownership.

And so the committee says to this family, "We think you have ability and motivation. We think you have what it takes to move even further up the economic ladder."

"So we are going to help you become the owner of this home. Since the payments are a little more than you can afford now, the government will pitch in and pay part of your interest cost. A few years later on, when you are earning a good deal more money, you can gradually begin to pay back that original government investment in you. What you are able to pay back will go to help another family coming along the same path. And if you have had luck along the way, and if you never quite make enough money to pay back any of that investment—don't worry about it. You won't owe anyone a thing."

Now that is a proposition with dignity. That says to a poor man today not, "Here is a government handout," but "We have faith that you and your family can make your own way."

Here, I think, is a helping hand that not only does not destroy dignity and pride in the person being helped, but actually encourages those feelings in him. Contrast this with welfare system, with its investigations and harassment and condescension, and I think you will see the power in it to uplift a man, not crush his spirit.

Now cynics will say that this is a tight-fisted scheme to tax the recently poor. I say it is a generous scheme to build pride and incentive in a poor man by investing in him—by helping him to have something and be somebody—and gently excusing him if he does not quite live up to our hopes.

There are countless other details and aspects of the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. I am sure you all have many questions which I have perhaps stimulated but not answered.

Over the next few months I will attempt to discuss and reply to many such questions, and I will expect to profit by your suggestions and, I hope, your support.

I am fully aware that this legislation is not perfect. I am aware that it does not provide the answer to all our slum housing problems or new hope to all slum people. But it is a beginning.

Last September, just as I first advanced the rudiments of this idea, President Johnson spoke at the Brookings Institution here in Washington. Speaking of his actions as President in coping with urban problems, the President said, "We need not delay action in the cities until Brookings, and its sister institutions, have given us a definitive answer . . . When governments are faced with great public dilemmas, they must shape their programs with the greatest wisdom that they possess, but governments must act. They cannot wait to act until all that is tentative and hypothetical can be established as firmly as a law of mathematics."

That is the spirit in which I will offer this legislation tomorrow. That is the spirit in which I hope it will be received.

I am hopeful that, perhaps with some further refinements, a National Home Ownership Foundation can be made a reality. When it is, we will have an important new tool for mobilizing the enormous resources of the private sector behind sound grassroots programs to make today's poor slum families the middle income home owners of tomorrow.

MAKING IT EASIER FOR THE RUSSIANS TO EXPORT COMMUNISM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities today heard testimony from Leonard I. Epstein, a New Jersey businessman who was approached by a Russian national in hopes of getting various technological items for the Russian's "customer."

Epstein related how Vadim Isakov, an employee of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, initiated his espionage efforts by indicating that he was interested in buying items for UNICEF—he was a UNICEF procurement officer—and ended up attempting to buy an underwater robot, which could be used for retrieving items from the ocean floor, accelerometers, which could be used to accomplish a soft landing on the moon by a space vehicle; a miniature computer, which could be used on board a space craft; titanium pressure vessels—it had to be titanium because of the weight factor; and flexible hoses used to fuel missiles prior to launch.

While a member of the staff of UNICEF was attempting clandestine purchases of American technological goods, the administration is attempting to make it easier for the enemy to get goods, mainly through the expansion of East-West trade. As Mr. Epstein said, much Russian technology is probably 30 to 40 years behind us.

Fortunately there is a group that is attempting to block this expansion. Headed by former Gov. John Davis Lodge, this group of distinguished individuals has apparently started on the right track by calling a spade a spade. This is seen in their name, Committee To End Aid to the Soviet Enemy.

Here is an article from the Washington Post of May 8, 1967, which lists the sponsors. As you can see they include businessmen.

EIGHT CEASE SPONSORS LISTED BY JOHN LODGE

John Davis Lodge, Republican former governor of Connecticut, announced last night eight sponsors for his Committee to End Aid to the Soviet Enemy (CEASE), a group dedicated to blocking administration efforts to increase West-East trade.

Lodge listed his sponsoring committee as: F. K. Weyerhaeuser, of the Weyerhaeuser Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Washington author and journalist; former U.S. Sen. William F. Knowland, publisher of the Oakland, Calif., Tribune; retired Adm. Arthur Radford of Washington, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

John B. Adams, a Washington publisher; Alex Parker Jr., of the Parker Tobacco Co., Maysville, Ky.; William Penn Patrick, board chairman of Holiday Magic Co.; retired Gen. Arthur Trudeau, chairman, Gulf Research and Development Co., of Pittsburgh, and retired Adm. Arleigh Burke, Washington.

Mr. Epstein stated this morning that the UNICEF employee apparently believed that American businessmen would be glad to sell to an unknown "European customer," anything to make a "buck."

"I think that most businessmen should

uphold the safety and security of their Nation and hang the dollar in these cases," Epstein told the committee. Needless to say, Mr. Epstein and his partner, Mr. George Yohrling, were more concerned about their country than making money and contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation as soon as they realized what was going on.

In contrast to Mr. Epstein and CEASE, I have an article from the New York Times of May 6, 1967, headed, "U.S. Pushes Drive for Soviet Trade." This article states that there is a renewed effort to "break a logjam in trade with the Soviet Union," and the "President ordered hundreds of goods removed from a list of products barred from sale to the Communist bloc." Here is the Times article:

U.S. PUSHES DRIVE FOR SOVIET TRADE—SPONSORS PARTICIPATION BY BUSINESS IN MOSCOW FAIR

(By Raymond H. Anderson)

Moscow, May 5.—The United States Government and American businessmen have started a campaign to break a log jam in trade with the Soviet Union.

For the first time, Washington is supporting the participation of American companies in a trade fair here. The exhibition, concentrating on food-processing and food-packaging equipment, will open May 16.

Also for the first time, an American trade mission is in the Soviet Union specifically to buy and sell. The group represents 15 Minneapolis concerns.

Another trade mission, from California, will arrive in Moscow May 15 to explore the potential for sales of farm machinery, food products and food processing equipment.

The surge of American interest in trade with the Soviet Union reflects, in part, the appeal last October by President Johnson for improved relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

As a step toward better relations, the President ordered hundreds of goods removed from a list of products barred from sale to the Communist bloc.

EXPANDING MARKET

The new interest in doing business with the Soviet Union also reflects an awareness that the country is now in the market for a wide variety of equipment as it drives for a major expansion in agriculture, automobiles and many other areas.

Eighteen American companies will have exhibits at the Moscow trade fair, called Inprodmash-67. The fair, which will last 13 days, will be in Sokolniki Park in the northeast section of the city.

Among the companies taking part are Crown Cork and Seal of Philadelphia, Dow Chemical of Midland, Mich., Fairbanks Morse, Glenrock, N.J., and Scientific Data System of Santa Monica, Calif.

Three soft-drink companies, Coca-Cola, Pepsi-Cola and Royal Crown Cola, will have exhibits at the fair in the hopes of persuading Soviet officials to allow them to produce their drinks under license.

Equipment for processing and packaging food is of vital interest to the Soviet Union, which loses a large amount of fresh food each harvest because of spoilage.

The Minneapolis trade mission, which arrived early this week and leaves Sunday for Poland, represents food-processing companies as well as concerns manufacturing farm equipment, road building equipment and industrial machinery.

Among the companies are Honeywell, Acrometal Products and John Deere.

The members of the mission have made no sales yet, but they hope some contracts will be signed within a year or so.

Soviet officials are reported they hope some contacts will be an artificial meat offered by one Wellens & Co. The product is made from soybeans.

According to Louis R. Brewster, vice president of the company, the Russians found it hard to believe that the samples he gave them were artificial.

Mr. Brewster said the products, including artificial ham, beef, bacon and hamburger, had a higher protein content than real meat.

The product, he added, would be offered to the Russians for about 30 cents a pound, which compares with a meat price here of more than a dollar a pound. Meat is still in short supply in the Soviet Union and Mr. Brewster's company is hopeful of making sales.

The California mission, which arrives later this month, will include the Elliot Manufacturing Company of Fresno, the West Coast Growers and Packers, of Selma, and the Blackwelder Manufacturing Company of Rio Vista.

Mr. Speaker, if my memory is correct, several of the firms mentioned in the Times article as participants of the Moscow trade fair were also mentioned this morning as sources of some of the items which the "unidentified European customer" wanted.

I think it is true that most Americans are against trading with the enemy but it seems that the administration is not.

For my part, I have introduced a resolution which would prohibit trade with the Soviet Union and satellite nations until there is solid evidence that they have called a halt to their alleged wars of liberation.

It would no doubt be profitable to export goods to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations, but our goods only make it easier for them to export communism.

CONSIDER WHAT HUD PLANS TO DO TO YOUR CITY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the administration is lavishly spending money and time to promote the "demonstration cities" program. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has convinced hundreds of cities that if the requested budget of \$662 million is appropriated for "demonstration cities," they will receive large grants to cure the economic, social, racial, educational, and esthetic ills of the cities. These promises have been misleading.

The techniques and tactics of the Department of Housing and Urban Development should be a fair warning of what can be expected in the "Federal cities" program. Not only will cities be prostituted by impossible promises, but Members of Congress will be treated like puppets on strings. "Vote for the appropriation, and your city will share the largess."

The model cities program is the first step in forging a new and predominant Department of Domestic Affairs to super-

sede all other domestic Cabinet departments and independent agencies.

Housing is only one objective of the model cities program—it has nothing to do with models or demonstrations. The Secretary will be in charge of all racial, social, and economic integration plans of this administration—and they are ambitious. Housing is no longer the principal objective. American housing is already far superior to any other housing in the history of mankind because of individual pride, ordinary citizen ambition, and private enterprise. Few cities, officials, or planners have had the courage to evaluate this model cities program. Whenever any question has been raised or inadequacy mentioned, the Department simply promised a grant.

A view of one experienced expert was published in the National Observer of May 1, 1967. All Members should consider the warning of Lewis Mumford, our country's foremost scholar in the field of urban problems:

ARTICLE BY MR. LEWIS MUMFORD

By profession I am a writer—not an architect, an engineer, or a city planner; and though I have been a professor of city and regional planning at the University of Pennsylvania I have no wish to appear before you as an urban specialist, an "expert," an authority. But please do not read any false humility into this statement. All the colossal mistakes that have been made during the last quarter century in urban renewal, highway building, transportation, land use, and recreation have been made by highly qualified experts and specialists—and as regards planning, I should blush to be found in their company. . . .

Is there any plausible reason for expecting any better results from wholesale government intervention, under our present auspices, no matter how much money you are prepared to spend? If you embark on such a program without asking far more fundamental questions about the reasons for our past failures, and if you fail to set up more human goals than those our expanding economy now pursues, you will be throwing public money down the drain. And worse: In the course of doing this, you will bring about even more villainous conditions than those you are trying to correct; for you will wipe out on a greater scale than ever what is left of neighborly life, social co-operation, and human identity in our already depressed and congested urban areas. . . .

Surely it is time that there was a general realization of the fact that we must deliberately contrive a new urban pattern; one that will more effectively mobilize the immense resources of our great metropolises without accepting the intolerable congestion that has driven increasing numbers of people to seek—at whatever sacrifice of time and social opportunity—at least a temporary breathing space in less congested suburban areas. The new form of the city must be conceived on a regional scale. Not subordinated to a single dominant center, but as a network of cities of different forms and sizes, set in the midst of publicly protected open spaces permanently dedicated to agriculture and recreation. In such a regional scheme the metropolis would be only the first among equals.

This is the organic type of city that the technology of our time, the electric grid, the telephone, the radio, television, fast transportation, information storage and transmission, has made possible. A handful of planners, notably Christopher Tunnard, has seen the implications of this new scale in urban planning. But most of our planning authorities still remain like a scratched phonograph record, with the needle stuck in the old met-

ropolitan groove. Many people, since the publication of Jean Gottmann's monumental survey, have tried to take comfort in the thought that the present disordered and disintegrating urban mass, which Gottmann has popularized as "megapolis," is in fact the modern form of the city, new, dynamic, and inevitable, whether we like it or not.

That is a silly idea, worthy only of a Marshall McLuhan or a Timothy Leary. You might say of this sprawling megapolitan nonentity, in McLuhan's terminology, that the mess is the message. And the more massive the mess, the more muddled the message.

Now, I have had to explain to myself why the ideas we put forward during the last half century often proved politically and financially acceptable, but only at the price of being sterilized, dehumanized, and degraded. But the full explanation dawned on me only recently in the course of an analysis I have been making on the basis assumptions and goals that have governed all large-scale technology since the Pyramid Age in Egypt some 5,000 years ago.

GROWTH OF THE MEGAMACHINE

From the earliest stages of civilization on, as I read the evidence, the most striking advances in mass technology have been the outcome of centralized organizations, deliberately expanding power in every form—mechanical power, political power, military power, financial power, and not least the scientific power of accurate analysis and prediction—to achieve control over both the natural environment and the human community. The astounding mechanical success of these high-powered technologies is due to their method of systematically breaking down ecological complexities by deliberately eliminating the human factor. I have called this ancient form of mechanized organization the "megamachine." Wherever it operates, it magnifies authoritarian power and minimizes human initiative, self-direction, and self-government.

The main point to observe is that there is a deep-seated antagonism between a mechanistic, power-centered economy and the far older organic life-centered economy; for a life economy seeks continuity, variety, order, and purposeful growth. Such an economy is cut to the human scale, so that every organism, every community, every human being shall have the variety of goods and experiences necessary for the fulfillment of his own individual life-course, from birth to death.

The basis of a life economy is a respect for organic limits. It seeks not the greatest possible quantity of any particular good, but the right quantity, of the right quality, at the right place and the right time, for the right purpose. Too much of any one thing is as fatal to living organisms as too little.

In contrast, a power economy is designed for the continuous expansion of a limited number of uniform goods—those are specially adapted to quantity production and remote control. Apart from enlarging the province of mechanization and automation itself, the chief goal of this economy is to produce the greatest amount of power, prestige, or profit for the distant controllers of the megamachine. Though these modern power systems produce a maximum quantity of highly specialized products—motors cars, refrigerators, washing machines, rockets, nuclear bombs—they cannot, on their own terms, do justice to the far more complex and varied needs of human life, for these needs cannot be mechanized and automated, still less controlled and suppressed, without killing something essential to the life of the organism or to the self-respect of the human personality.

For the last century, we Americans have been systematically indoctrinated in the virtues of mass production and have accepted, with unctious, the plethora of goods offered,

in which even those on public relief now participate. But we have been carefully trained to look only at the plus side of the equation, and to close our eyes to the appalling defects and failures that issue from the very success of the megamachine.

No sound public policy in housing and urban renewal can be formulated till we have reckoned with these liabilities. The overproduction of motor cars has not only wrecked our once-efficient and well-balanced transportation system, and turned our big cities into hollow shells, exploding with violence; but it has polluted the air with lethal carbon monoxide, and even, with the use of lead in gasoline, dangerously poisoned our water and food. The chemical industry, in its undisciplined effort to sell a maximum amount of its products, has poisoned our soils and our foods with DDT, malathion, and other deadly compounds, while heedlessly befouling our water supply with detergents.

So, too, with the pharmaceutical industry, the rocket industry, the television industry, the pornography and narcotics industries. All have become immensely dynamic and profitable enterprises, automatically expanding, and by their very expansion callously disregarding human health, safety, and welfare, while wiping out every trace of organic variety and active human choice.

The point I am now making challenges, I regret to say, not only some of the published views of your chairman, but probably the views of the rest of this committee. You accept, I take it, the current American faith in the necessity for an expanding machine-centered economy, as if this were one of the great laws of nature, or if not, then America's happiest contribution to human prosperity and freedom. I wish you were right.

But do you seriously believe that a housing industry based, as Senator Ribicoff has put it, on "the technology of megapolis" will be any more regardful of human needs and human satisfactions, or any more eager to overcome the distortions and perversions of a power-obsessed, machine-driven, money-oriented economy? If so, you are ignoring the very factors that have mocked and ruined so many of our previous efforts at urban improvement. This expanding economy, for all its suffocating abundance of machine-made goods and gadgets, has resulted in a dismally contracted life, lived for the most part confined to a car or a television set; a life so empty of vivid firsthand experience that it might as well be lived in a space capsule, traveling from nowhere to nowhere at supersonic speeds.

Space capsules—yes, stationary space capsules—that is what most of our new buildings are, and our prefabricated foods taste increasingly like those supplied in tubes to astronauts; while in our urban planning schools I have encountered ominous designs for whole cities to be built underground, or underwater, so that their inhabitants may live and die without ever coming into contact with the living environment, which has been essential to the human race for organic health, psychological stability, and cultural growth for at least 500,000 years. And in boasting of the fact that automation will soon be able to do away with all serious and humanly rewarding work, manual or mental, we are threatening to remove perhaps the most essential historic invention for preserving mental balance and furthering the arts of life. These are all danger signals. Is it not time to give them heed?

Now your chairman, in his able speech last January, attempted to bring together what seems to me, if I may speak frankly, two altogether incompatible, in fact downright antagonistic, proposals: On one hand for restoring neighborhoods as the basic human environment, on the other for applying to housing what he called, quite properly, the technology of megapolis. Senator Ribicoff

wisely recognized the need to respect the small unit, the neighborhood, in order to promote those qualities we associate, at least as an ideal, with the small town—meaning, I take it, a place where everyone has an identifiable face and is a recognizable and responsible person—not just a Social Security number, a draft-card number, or a combination of digits on a computer.

As to neighborhoods, I am entirely on his side. I have not spent part of my life in a small country community, and another part in a planned neighborhood unit, Sunnyside Gardens, Long Island, without learning to appreciate these intimate small-town virtues. And I believe the greatest defect of the United States Constitution was its original failure, despite the example of the New England township and the town meeting, to make this democratic local unit the basic cell of our whole system of government. For democracy, in any active sense, begins and ends in communities small enough for their members to meet face to face.

But if your purpose is to do urban planning and renewal on the basis of neighborhoods and balanced urban communities, you would, I submit, be deceiving yourselves if you imagined that a vast contribution by the Federal Government—\$50 billion over 10 years has been suggested—could possibly achieve the happy results you hope for. Such a massive expenditure succeeded, we all know, in producing the atom bomb; and it has been applied with equal success in producing rockets, space satellites, supersonic jets, and similar instruments of physical conquest or destruction.

But note—this method can be applied only to those structures or machine assemblages that can be designed without the faintest regard for the human factor, and without any feedback from the human reaction. This patently leaves out the neighborhood and the city. Unless human needs and human interactions and human responses are the first consideration, the city, in any valid human sense, cannot be said to exist, for, as Sophocles long ago said, "The city is people."

Accordingly, I beg you to look a little more closely at what such a huge supply of capital, with such large prospective profits, would do. Not merely would it skyrocket already inflated land values so that a disproportionate amount would go to the property owners and real estate speculators; but even worse—it would invite ever greater megamachines to invade the building industry. With \$50 billion as bait, a new kind of aerospace industry would move in, with all its typical paraphernalia of scientific research and engineering design. At that moment your plans for creating humanly satisfactory neighborhoods would go up in smoke.

ENFORCED CONFORMITY

"General Space-Housing, Inc." will solve your housing problem, swiftly and efficiently, though not painlessly, by following its own typical method, derived from the ancient pyramid builders: eliminate the human factor by enforcing conformity and destroying choice.

Once started, such a scientifically ordered housing industry, commanding virtually unlimited capital at national expense, and providing, as in the Pentagon's favored industries, indecently large salaries and exorbitant profits for private investors, would be geared for further expansion. And it would achieve this expansion, not only by designing units prefabricated for early obsolescence, but likewise by wiping out, as dangerous rivals, those parts of the rural or urban environment that were built on a more human plan.

I have only nibbled at the edges of this difficult subject. My final words must be mostly words of negation and caution. Go slow! Experiment with small measures and small units. Whatever you do in extending

the policies followed in the past will almost surely meet with the same embarrassments and the same failures.

Remember that you cannot overcome the metropolitan congestion of the last century, or the cataclysmic disintegration of urban life during the last 30 years, by instituting a crash program. You are much more likely to produce more lethal congestion, more rapid disintegration, ending in a greater crash. The time for action on a massive scale has not yet come. But the time for fresh thinking on this whole subject is long overdue.

BILL TO PROHIBIT DESECRATION OF FLAG GAINS SUPPORT

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill which I originally introduced in the second session of the 89th Congress, which would prohibit desecration of the American flag.

This bill, similar to several which have been introduced by my colleagues during this session, would provide for imprisonment for not more than 1 year and a fine of not more than \$1,000 for anyone who publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, defies, tramples upon, or casts contempt, either by word or act, on any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States.

It is strange to see in our newspapers pictures of American young men facing danger and death in Vietnam while in these same editions there are pictures of other Americans burning their Nation's flag in the safety of an American park.

While we pride ourselves on the right of dissent in our Nation, a right which was established by our Founding Fathers and one which must remain inviolate, there is a point at which dissent ends and disloyalty begins. This great right of dissent was never intended to allow the desecration or mutilation of our American flag, a symbol of our national heritage.

And even as I have read and heard with disgust of recent desecrations of our flag, so have I been heartened and encouraged by my many colleagues who have introduced legislation to prohibit this; and by the prompt hearings granted similar bills by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope these hearings will be followed by quick and positive action to end these disgraceful exhibitions.

RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the traditional anniversary of the day of Rumania's independence,

but the people of Rumania, locked behind the Iron Curtain, may not celebrate this day.

Those who have escaped from their homeland to the freedom of America, continue to mark this national holiday, and today at the Carnegie Endowment National Center in New York City, messages will be read, preparatory to broadcasting them to the Rumanians behind the Iron Curtain.

We others in America who are fortunate enough to have our heritage of freedom, must step forward this day to join in sending messages of hope which can help to keep alive the will to fight for the restoration of freedom.

Rumanians today are denied the right to mark their traditional day of independence because their overlords order them to observe May 9, the date on which the Russian forces defeated the Nazis in Rumania.

May 10 was selected by the Rumanian people to commemorate three significant events in their history: the establishment of the Principality of Rumania in 1266, independence won from Turkey in 1877, and the establishment of their nation as a kingdom in 1881.

During its period as an independent nation, Rumania had one of the more socially progressive and stable governments in Europe. Liberal reforms had been instituted by Rumania, including a land reform measure which gave the peasantry an opportunity to acquire ownership of much of the land. A compulsory educational system was established. By the provisions of the 1923 Rumanian Constitution, male suffrage came into existence in Rumania.

Yet it was to be the tragic fate of the Rumanian people again to fall under foreign subjugation. Following World War II, a Communist regime was imposed on them, and the people were terrorized into submission.

Life today in Rumania means strict police-state surveillance. It means submitting to Communist Party directives on a broad range of everyday matters from housing and holidays. It even means being dependent on the party's favor to earn a livelihood.

Despite years of indoctrination, the Communists have not succeeded in erasing the national consciousness of the Rumanian people. They continue to yearn for freedom—freedom from foreign control for their nation and the individual freedoms now denied them.

Even the Communist functionaries in Rumania are becoming more responsive to the undercurrent surge of nationalism permeating the population of Rumania today. Partly to gain greater popular support and partly a reflection of the current trend of the loosening ties within the Soviet bloc, Rumanian Communists have adopted one of the more independent courses taken by the East European nations.

The Rumanian Communists have gone perhaps even further than any other East European nation in attempting to de-Russify Rumania. Russian-language courses are no longer compulsory in Rumanian secondary schools, national history books are being corrected to

eliminate some of the pro-Soviet slanted material, and even street names have been changed.

Although the more nationalistic policy adopted by the Rumanian Communists may produce an amelioration of the living conditions in Rumania, the Rumanian people will never be satisfied by a mere reassertion of national identity. Not until that national identity assumes the form of a restoration of national and individual freedom will the Rumanian people be truly satisfied.

On this occasion of the Rumanian national holiday, we Americans wish to express again our lasting friendship toward the Rumanian people, our continuing prayers for the restoration of their complete independence, and our deepest hope that the Rumanian people will soon be in control again of their own government and their individual lives.

UNITY AND THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I had a firsthand opportunity to observe the conduct of the biennial convention of the National Federation of Republican Women which was held in Washington during last week. I know when I see a railroad running through the middle of the house so it was not hard to observe what was transpiring.

It appears to me that a decision was made that Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly should not be elected President of NFRW and every tactic and device was used to accomplish this objective. I saw many of them. Others can only be the subject of conjecture. For example, it would appear that the only real reason for postponing the convention which was originally scheduled for last year in California was for the purpose of undercutting Mrs. Schlafly.

It is also interesting to note that the theme of last week's convention was unity. If Mrs. Schlafly wants to support those who stacked the deck against her, it would be sheer grace on her part. On the other hand, it is clear to me that those who manipulated, gave unfair rulings and engaged in unfair tactics have no right whatsoever to ask for unity. They were the most divisive force I have ever seen in the Republican Party—the same dominant elements we saw playing the spoiler's role in 1964.

A formal objection has been lodged by a number of the pro-Schlafly delegates. Their objections are not those of sore losers but of indignant women who witnessed this affair. I include their letter and two newspaper articles in the RECORD at this point:

MAY 8, 1967.

Mr. RAY BLISS,
National Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BLISS: The undersigned women, who served as delegates to the Convention of the National Federation of Republican Women in Washington, D.C. on May 5-6, formally protest the gross illegalities and

irregularities which characterized both the Convention proceedings and the election. We believe that these irregularities defeated the choice of the majority of the delegates and members of the Federation. We urge that you initiate an investigation by impartial persons acceptable to both candidates.

1. The Credentials Committee wrongfully deprived about 100 Schlafly delegates of their right to vote at this Convention for reasons which were either completely invalid or of doubtful validity. At the same time, the Committee wrongfully seated about 800 O'Donnell delegates from New York and Pennsylvania who should have been disqualified for the very fundamental reason of not paying their full dues. Some of the specifics on these cases are set forth in the Minority Report of the Credentials Committee.

It is a shocking double standard that little pro-Schlafly clubs were disqualified for being allegedly one or two days late in paying their dues, but the big pro-O'Donnell states of New York and Pennsylvania were allowed to vote although they paid only about half the dues required by Section 4 of Article 3 of the NFRW bylaws. The official NFRW Statistical Report proves that New York paid on membership of only 32,500 for 1965 and 1966, although the "actual membership is 65,000," which means that New York, in effect, paid only 5¢ per capita dues, while all states other than New York and Pennsylvania paid 10¢ per capita dues.

The same NFRW Statistical Reports prove that Pennsylvania made only a token payment of about one-quarter what they owed in 1965, and one-third what they owed in 1966. Thus, for two of the three years since the last NFRW Convention, New York and Pennsylvania are substantially in arrears in their dues, and a large percentage or all of their delegates should have been barred from voting at this Convention.

Another pro-O'Donnell state which was permitted serious deviations from the dues requirement was Oregon. Oregon did not pay its dues for 1967 until about 10 days after the deadline, and then only in response to a telegram request from the NFRW office. By contrast, 12 Schlafly delegates were disqualified because the state treasurer forwarded the dues to the national office one day late. In Texas, 17 pro-Schlafly clubs were barred from voting for tardiness in paying dues, although it was proved that these clubs had been given erroneous information about the date of the dues deadline.

Because of one erroneous challenge, brought to the Credentials Committee by a single O'Donnell supporter, 26 Wisconsin delegates who had complied with all rules and paid their registration fees and were wearing their badges, were made to wait 48 hours standing, sitting and lying in hot and stuffy halls, missing \$23 worth of meals they had already paid for and two nights of sleep; they were finally cleared at 5 A.M. the morning of voting. This was in shocking contrast to the automatic credentialing and registering of hundreds of delegates arriving by busloads from pro-O'Donnell states, some arriving as late as five hours after voting had begun.

2. The principal credentialing of delegates was not handled by an impartial credentials or registration committee, but was turned over to state presidents, 35 of whom were in the O'Donnell campaign organization. This meant that state presidents could hand the badges over to anyone of their own choosing, without any check whatsoever on whether they were proper delegates. There was no guarantee against badges being given to unauthorized persons; there was even no guarantee against one woman voting twice with different badges. The result was that, the morning of the voting, busloads of women arrived from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan who were taken immediately to their state headquarters,

given badges, instructed how to vote, herded through the voting area, and then put back on the buses and driven home without ever going to the Convention floor or participating in the Convention. In the absence of proof to the contrary, it can be assumed that these were not legitimate delegates "from each club," as specified in the NFRW bylaws, but were women appointed by their state presidents to "represent" clubs to which they never belonged.

3. Although the official Call to Convention stated that, in order to vote, a delegate must present the yellow credential slip signed by her club president and countersigned by her club treasurer, this requirement was abandoned at the Convention. Delegates were permitted to vote without showing this yellow form to the tellers, so that there were no cross checks with the ballot machine spindle cards against this official form. Further, there are many tellers who will testify to other irregularities of voting procedures. Some 95 Schlafly delegates from Ohio were subjected to incredible harassment and delay after they arrived in the voting area.

4. Mrs. Elston, as presiding officer, denied the Convention the right to accept or reject any Credentials Committee report. This is clearly contrary to Section 71 of Roberts Rules of Order Revised which states that the adoption of the Credentials report shall be the first order of business. There was never an official determination before the election of how many delegates were entitled to vote. Repeated attempts from the Convention floor to demand the Credentials Committee report were ruled out of order.

5. We have never yet been given any accurate or satisfactory Credentials Committee report. As of today, we do not know how many delegates were present and entitled to vote.

6. In the Convention hall, the seating was NOT alphabetical, but arranged in a manner beneficial to pro-O'Donnell states. New York, Pennsylvania and Michigan were seated together in the front rows under the television lights, while the pro-Schlafly states were seated in the poorly-lighted rear of the hall and on the outer fringes. Thus, it was physically impossible for the chair to rule fairly or accurately on any close voice or standing votes.

7. The floor of the Convention was policed with such efficient control that leaders of Mrs. Schlafly's delegations could not even communicate with one another or with the chair. Microphones were usually turned off in the area of the pro-Schlafly states. Men were controlling and directing the entire Convention floor. Visitors imported from areas hostile to Mrs. Schlafly were made sergeants-at-arms. A force of hired police was stationed at all doors, and Schlafly delegates were not allowed to leave by side doors convenient to the ladies' room. Mrs. Grace Thackeray, president of the Southern Division of the California Federation, heading a membership of 40,000 women, could not walk down the aisle to speak to a member of her delegation without being harassed and threatened. When she tried to speak to a point of personal privilege, she was never recognized. A network of control prevented her leaving the floor to talk with reporters, or to speak with them on the floor.

8. It was a clear conflict of interest for Mrs. Dorothy Elston, the real campaign manager of Mrs. O'Donnell campaign, to preside at the Convention. For many months, Mrs. Elston had used the National Federation office as a campaign headquarters for Mrs. O'Donnell and against Mrs. Schlafly, the elected First Vice President. Mrs. Elston continued her partisan and prejudicial behavior in the conduct of every phase of the Convention and the election. She named all the Convention committees, which resulted in a ratio of 15 Schlafly supporters out of 109 committee members. Only after a strong

protest was lodged by Schlafly supporters did Mrs. Elston agree to some additional Schlafly tellers. The president of the Hawaii Federation, Mrs. Ruth Jackson, resigned as a member of the Credentials Committee because of its steady stream of biased decisions.

9. The many violations of proper parliamentary procedure and Roberts Rules of Order are too numerous to list. Many points have been already mentioned. In addition, there was no Treasurer's Report presented, probably because it would have brought up embarrassing questions about the failure of New York and Pennsylvania to pay their full dues. By a series of maneuvers, the chair successfully evaded the presentation of the Credentials Committee report, although Roberts Rules say that a change in the Convention program requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote.

10. Mrs. Schlafly's representatives were denied the right to watch the preparation and sealing of the voting machines, and denied the right to test-vote them, although Mrs. Elston had promised this in writing in her letter to Mrs. Schlafly's campaign manager, Mrs. Kate Hoffman. Mrs. Elston's letter also promised that Mrs. Schlafly's representatives would be notified of the time of the preparation of the voting machines. Such notice was not given. When Mrs. Schlafly's ballot security representatives accidentally discovered that the preparation of the voting machines was in process and 6 of the 20 machines had already been sealed, they tried to watch the preparation of the remaining machines. They were ejected from the voting machine area and not permitted to do this.

11. As late as 6 A.M., Mrs. Schlafly's representatives indicated that they would be satisfied with a spot check of the backs of the machines, but even this was denied. The cursory viewing of the outsides of the machines then permitted was no guarantee whatsoever of a fair election, and cannot possibly substitute for inspection of the sealing of the machines.

12. A formal challenge to the whole election was presented on the floor of the Convention. Please note that this challenge was presented while the election was taking place—not after the election results were known. The delegate who presented the challenge, Mrs. Rosalind Frame, stated that she was making the challenge regardless of who won the election.

13. What is at stake here is the integrity of the ballot. In our opinion this was a controlled and rigged election which has constituted an election fraud depriving the half million Federated Republican women of their representation at the National Convention. Republicans cannot point their fingers at election frauds in Texas and Cook County unless our own elections are, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

Respectfully submitted.

Mrs. KATE HOFFMAN,
Illinois.
Mrs. GRACE THACKERAY,
California.
Miss LUCILLE BOSTON,
California.
Mrs. RUTH MURRAY,
Wisconsin.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 8, 1967]

MRS. SCHLAFLY CHARGES FRAUD IN GOP VOTING—4 BACKERS ASK BLISS TO MAKE INVESTIGATION

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly of Alton, Ill., charged fraud today in the election Saturday in which she was defeated for president of the National Federation of Republican Women.

She and her conservative followers demanded an impartial investigation of what

they called a "controlled and rigged election" that constituted an "election fraud."

Four of her lieutenants asked for the inquiry in a letter addressed to Ray Bliss, chairman of the Republican National Committee. She said it would be hand delivered to Bliss today.

Mrs. Schlafly, elaborating on the charges at a press conference, accused "New York-based liberals" of defeating her. She and her aids blamed the "eastern establishment" for the continuing split in the 500,000-member women's federation.

ILLEGALITIES CHARGED

The victor in the election Saturday was Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell, a Long Beach (Calif.) businesswoman and airplane pilot. The vote was 1910 to 1494.

The letter protested against "gross illegalities and irregularities" in the election and in the proceedings of the federation's convention, held here Friday and Saturday.

"We believe that these irregularities defeated the choice of the majority of the delegates and members of the federation," the letter said.

"We urge that you initiate an investigation by impartial persons acceptable to both candidates."

The women charged that the credentials committee wrongfully deprived about 100 pro-Schlafly delegates of the right to vote but wrongfully seated about 800 O'Donnell delegates from New York and Pennsylvania who had not paid their full dues.

Handling of credentials was turned over to state presidents; 35 of whom were in the O'Donnell campaign organization, the letter said. They contended that there was no guarantee against passing badges around or even voting twice with different badges.

"The result was that, the morning of the voting, busloads of women arrived from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan, who were taken immediately to their state headquarters, given badges, instructed how to vote, herded through the voting area, and then put back on the busses and driven home without ever going to the convention floor or participating in the convention."

The bill of particulars charged also that there never was any satisfactory credentials committee report.

"As of today, we do not know how many delegates were present and entitled to vote," it said.

The letter charged the retiring president, Mrs. Dorothy Elston, with a conflict of interest on the ground that she was "the real campaign manager" for Mrs. O'Donnell.

"Mrs. Elston continued her partisan and prejudicial behavior in the conduct of every phase of the convention and the election," the letter said.

INSPECTION BARRED

It repeated earlier charges that Mrs. Schlafly's representatives were denied the right to inspect the voting machine as promised in advanced by Mrs. Elston.

Mrs. Schlafly said she did not expect legal action if the demand for an inquiry was rejected.

"I don't have any faith in any legal action, so there really isn't much recourse except to tell people the truth and make sure it doesn't happen again," she said.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 9, 1967]

THE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S DEBACLE

It was the Republican party, not Phyllis Schlafly, who suffered a defeat in the voting of the National Federation of Republican Women in Washington this past weekend.

Mrs. Schlafly was so clearly the better candidate that, left to personal selection, there would have been no contest. She was next in line for the presidency, but completely beyond this rather substantial claim, Phyllis Schlafly is brilliant, hardworking, energetic

and beautiful—a hard combination to beat in any league.

Her opponent proclaimed herself a "simple garden variety of uncomplicated Republican." It is difficult to imagine anything that the Republican party needs less in these troubled times.

Not everyone will always agree with Mrs. Schlafly, although this newspaper has watched her career over the years with considerable enthusiasm. At the very least, her party regularity, her unfailing enthusiasm for Republican candidates, as demonstrated in many elections, and her contagious enthusiasm in support of good causes made her the ideal selection.

There seems little doubt that she was counted out, which isn't the first time that this has happened to a Republican candidate in recent years.

Many of her adherents, properly qualified dues-paying Republicans, were disfranchised without hearing on flimsy technicalities while bus loads of ladies of dubious political background at best were rushed in at the last moment under the aegis of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, that perennial spoiler of Republican chances, and were allowed to vote.

It is regrettable that Mrs. Rosemary Ginn, Republican National Committeewoman in Missouri, whose tenure has scarcely been showered with the roses of success in this state, allied herself with the Rockefeller stop-Schlafly faction.

Our prediction is, knowing Mrs. Schlafly, that she will continue her energetic fight for Republican causes and that she will be crowned with the eventual success which is due here talent and her vision.

The Republican party has an excellent chance of electing a President and a number of Governors, Senators, Congressmen and lesser officials next year.

They will not do it, however, if they persist in trying to give the election away by such means as the abortive anti-Johnson, so-called policy statement last week, and the Schlafly robbery at the polls last weekend.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINDBERGH'S FLIGHT

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 40th anniversary of Lindbergh's flight from New York to Paris. A replica of the original "Spirit of St. Louis" has been painstakingly reconstructed by Frank Tallman of the Tallmantz Aviation Co. in Orange County, Calif. Beginning today, this exact flying replica of Lindbergh's "Spirit" is on display at North Island Naval Air Station in San Diego. With Tallman in the cockpit, the model "Spirit" will take off today at 3:55 Pacific daylight time, the exact time of Lindbergh's departure in 1927, and will fly over the San Diego area. From there, the plane will be transported by the Department of Commerce to the Paris Air Show in France where the Tallman replica will be the centerpiece of the U.S. Pavilion at the airshow. In Paris, Tallman plans to reenact the historic landing on May 21 at Le Bourget.

I can still recall my excitement as a schoolboy in Calexico, Calif., when I saw Charles Lindbergh fly his "Spirit" of St.

Louis. He was touring the country just a few months after his historymaking transatlantic flight and we "kids," at the time, were let out of school to watch the "Spirit" circle overhead.

Many San Diegans can remember far more than just catching a glimpse of the original plane, for a number of our citizens worked with Lindbergh in the construction and testing of his aircraft. At this point, I would like to insert a story by Robert Zimmerman from the San Diego Union describing the vital role of these aircraft workers:

"SPIRIT OF ST. LOUIS" BRINGS BACK MEMORIES

(By Robert Zimmerman)

The replica of the Spirit of St. Louis that will appear in the sky over San Diego this week embodies a dream that goes back many years for some San Diegans.

They are men who worked on the original plane for Charles Lindbergh 40 years ago and have hoped to see one like it fly again.

Although the replica to be flown here Wednesday was built by the Tallmantz Aviation Co. in Orange County, its close resemblance to the original is due in part to a project undertaken several years ago in San Diego.

This was "Project We," a program of the San Diego Aerospace Museum which was aimed at putting a new Spirit of St. Louis into the air on the 40th anniversary of Lindbergh's solo hop across the Atlantic.

Although "Project We" got only part-way toward its goal, it covered important groundwork leading to the construction of the Tallmantz replica.

FOR PARIS SHOW

Frank Tallman, a movie pilot whose firm at the Orange County Airport has produced many reproductions of early aircraft for Hollywood films, decided last fall to build a Spirit of St. Louis replica to be flown at the Paris Air Show this year.

Tallman wanted it to be a dead-ringer, even down to the ribs and spars that would be hidden by fabric. He began collecting all the records and drawings pertaining to the original that he could find.

The Ryan Aeronautical Co. came up with an extensive file of 1927 photographs showing the original Spirit in different phases of construction. Other 40-year-old documents gave additional specifications.

But nothing in the way of original factory blueprints could be found. Then Tallman got a helping hand from "Project We."

A set of shop drawings—painstakingly reproduced by men who had worked on the original—had been assembled at the Aerospace Museum. Much of the work had been done by Dan Burnett of 8069 Culowee St., La Mesa, now an employee of Rohr Corp. He had served as foreman in the wing assembly shop when the first Spirit was made by Ryan Airlines, Inc.

Tallman's craftsmen added these drawings to their collection of Spirit of St. Louis records and went to work. John Van der Linde of 4550 56th St., a retired Ryan engineer who also worked on the original, visited the Tallman shops for consultations as the new Spirit began to take shape.

When Tallman took the replica on its maiden flight two weeks ago, he said he was satisfied that it not only looked like the original but flew just like it as well. It is as close to a perfect reproduction as anyone could hope for, he said.

Many San Diegans who had a hand in building the first Spirit of St. Louis will be able to size up the replica when it goes on display at North Island Naval Air Station Wednesday.

Ed Morrow, who lives at 1271 Clarendon St., El Cajon, and retired two years ago as a Ryan employee, was another who worked on the first Spirit and has been active in "Project We."

Morrow is one of those whom Lindbergh recalls meeting at the Ryan shops on Harbor Drive when he came here in February, 1927, to supervise construction of his plane by Ryan Airlines. The events are recounted in Lindbergh's 1953 book, "The Spirit of St. Louis."

Lindbergh had dealt first by telegram with T. Claude Ryan, now chairman of the Ryan Aeronautical Co., who was then a partner in Ryan Airlines with B. F. Mahoney. Shortly before Lindbergh came here, Ryan sold his interest in the firm to Mahoney.

DESIGN CREDITED

The 25-year-old air mail pilot whose name would one day be known throughout the world spent hours in consultation with Donald Hall, then the chief engineer for the Ryan firm, who now lives at 3330 Xenophon St.

Hall is credited with the actual design of the plane—a modification of the M-2 monoplane which Ryan was building to fly the mail. Changes had to be made in the wing and fuselage to create a plane that could get off the ground with enough fuel aboard to make a non-stop flight from New York to Paris.

Lindbergh tells of leaning over Hall's shoulder under a bare light bulb as the Spirit of St. Louis took shape on a drawing board, and of strolling with Hall on the Silver Strand beach as they ironed out details of the design.

At one point, Lindbergh and Hall went to the San Diego public library to figure out just how far it was from New York to Paris. They stretched a piece of white grocery string across the library's globe and calculated the span as 3,600 statute miles.

Lindbergh also writes of his association with Hawley Bowlus, who was the Ryan factory manager and now lives in the San Fernando Valley. Bowlus spent many years in San Diego, and during the 1930s he taught Lindbergh and his wife to pilot gliders off Point Loma.

Another figure around the Ryan shops in 1927 was Douglas Corrigan, who would some day earn the nickname "Wrong-Way" for a transatlantic flight of his own. Corrigan is now an orange grower in Orange County.

In San Diego, Lindbergh also met the late Fred Rohr for the first time. Then Rohr's small firm was supplying fuel tanks and cowlings for Ryan planes. The Rohr Corp. is now one of the major aircraft subassembly manufacturers in the nation.

In his book, Lindbergh describes his departure from North Island May 10. He had set 4 p.m. for his departure time, but actually took off 5 minutes early.

"At 3:40 I crawl into my flying suit. It's uncomfortably hot in this California sun, but I can't very well put the suit on while I'm in the air—and I'll certainly need it over the mountain ranges tonight. . . .

"We start and warm up the engine. It's a few minutes early, but why wait longer in the heat? I wave good-bye, taxi into position, and ease the throttle open. As I pick up speed, I hold the tail low to put as much load as possible on the wings and reduce the strain on the landing gear. . . .

"The take-off wasn't as difficult as I expected. It's 3:55 Pacific. I make a mental note of the time, check instruments, pull the throttle back slightly, and begin a wide, climbing turn to the left. . . .

"We circle North Island, the factory, and the city of San Diego. Then, leaving ocean and bay behind, I set my compass heading for St. Louis."

The story by no means ends here. The building of the "Spirit of St. Louis" was

only the beginning of San Diego's paramount role in the development of aviation. Lindbergh's flight, however, more than any other single event, put the stamp "Made in U.S.A." on future advances in aeronautics and the fantastic air age in which we are privileged to live.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the Congress recognize this anniversary date as the beginning of many productive and far-reaching years of aviation for San Diego, and the Nation, by passage of the following resolution which I am introducing today in conjunction with my San Diego colleague, the gentleman from California, JAMES B. UTT:

H. RES. 470

Whereas the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the historic transatlantic flight of Charles A. Lindbergh in his plane, the "Spirit of St. Louis," will be commemorated in San Diego, California, on May 10, 1967; and

Whereas that historic flight began at Rockwell Field in San Diego, the "Spirit of St. Louis" was built in San Diego, and San Diego has been the site of many other firsts in the annals of aviation; and

Whereas the Department of Commerce will transport the only exact flying replica of the "Spirit of St. Louis" to Paris, France, for the reenactment on May 21, 1967, of Lindbergh's landing at Le Bourget, France, on May 21, 1927; and

Whereas that replica of the "Spirit of St. Louis" will become a focal point of the United States pavilion at the Paris Air Show; and

Whereas the efforts of the San Diego community linked with the United States Government will form a bridge of friendship with the people of France which is appropriate to the 40th anniversary of that historic flight: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of San Diego, California, be commended for its community leadership in this worthy international event.

RESPECT FOR OUR FLAG AND RESPECT FOR OUR CONSTITUTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of our colleagues share by revulsion at the burning of the American Flag by those who oppose our country's foreign policy. But we must guard against the danger that such revulsion may lead to unnecessary and unwise legislative action. Respect for our flag and respect for our Constitution must go hand in hand.

In the overheated atmosphere of emotionalism that prevails, a breath of fresh air is provided by the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning; it reads as follows:

RESPECT FOR THE FLAG

The American flag is an emblem of the United States. As such, of course, it deserves respect; and any misuse or desecration of it is properly and understandably offensive to Americans. But respect for the flag means respect for the great values of which it is em-

blematic. It represents a nation which, in its fundamental charter, recognizes dissent from prevailing opinion as vital to the general welfare, which fosters diversity and individuality as socially desirable and which guarantees freedom for the expression even of opinions which a majority abhors.

Some of the recent clamor in the House of Representatives for protection of the flag by legislation seems grossly ignorant of these values. Congressmen who urge their countrymen to "forget the First Amendment" or who talk wildly about firing squads for flag-burners or who propose to make verbal contempt for the flag a Federal crime do greater violence to the flag of the United States and to its meaning than the worst of the boorish oafs who fancy that setting fire to a flag is a meaningful form of protest.

Every one of the 50 American states and the District of Columbia now has a law forbidding such behavior. There is not the slightest need for Federal legislation invading the jurisdiction of the states in this connection. And in point of fact the Federal Government has no facilities for enforcing such legislation. Let's not inflate a nuisance into a menace.

Flag burning is a silly and ineffectual gesture on the level of hanging someone in effigy. The person hung in effigy may be annoyed but is unlikely to be injured. But the United States can be gravely endangered by official outbursts of hysterical "patriotism" aimed at odious opinions—or at odious expressions of opinion. The country's temperature is already feverish. Genuine patriotism will aim at cooling it down, not at heating it up.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed the tabulation of a questionnaire which I sent to every resident in my congressional district in February. The thousands of replies received are a tribute to the interest taken by my constituents on important public issues.

For the benefit of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I insert the results at this point in the RECORD:

I. VIETNAM

1. Do you favor these steps in an effort to get peace talks going (as recommended by U Thant):

A. Stop bombing in North Vietnam:

	Percent
Yes	45
No	49
Undecided	6

B. Agree that the National Liberation Front (Vietcong political arm) should be party to peace talks in its own right:

	Percent
Yes	66
No	25
Undecided	9

C. Reduce level of fighting in South Vietnam (i.e., de-escalate):

	Percent
Yes	43
No	51
Undecided	6

2. Assuming the fighting in Vietnam continues, how do you want your Congressman to vote on Defense Appropriation bills:

	Percent
For	73
Against	27

II. OTHER FOREIGN POLICY

1. Should U.S. support U.N. decision to compel Rhodesia to move toward majority rule?

	Percent
Yes	60
No	27
Undecided	13

2. Do you favor President Johnson's efforts to "build bridges" to communist countries of Eastern Europe, for instance through increased trade?

	Percent
Yes	70
No	24
Undecided	6

III. The draft: The Selective Service Act expires this year. Which of the following alternatives do you favor for the future?

	Percent
A. Continue the existing system of selective service with its limited exemptions (for students, etc.)	23
B. Use a lottery with exemptions only for health reasons or where family circumstances absolutely demand them	19
C. Draft all youngsters of given age and require either military or other national service (e.g. community service, conservation corps, etc.)	44
D. Other (specify)	14

IV. I favor federally assisted research to help develop an inexpensive electrically-powered car as a means of fighting air pollution. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes	77
No	17
Undecided	6

V. Do you favor the President's proposal to make all wiretapping and "bugging" illegal except where a judge certifies that the national security is involved?

	Percent
Yes	86
No	5
Undecided	9

VI. Would you favor a law limiting the total amount of TV and radio time that candidates for public office could buy?

	Percent
Yes	75
No	17
Undecided	8

VII. On the question of mail order sales of firearms, do you believe they should be

	Percent
Prohibited	58
Strictly regulated	36
Allowed to continue as is	6

VIII. Trading stamps: Which of the following statements most nearly reflects your views:

	Percent
A. The gifts from redeemed trading stamps are a pleasant bonus for shopping in certain stores	12
B. Trading stamps mean higher prices and are unwanted	55
C. Use of trading stamps, which have good and bad features, should be more closely regulated	33

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]

may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, throughout history Rumania has been a crossroad between East and West in southeastern Europe. Partly for that reason, up to the latter half of the 19th century Rumania was divided among her neighbors for nearly 400 years, and the Rumanians had to endure alien rule. During those centuries Rumania was part of the Ottoman Empire and it was ruled by the callous and corrupt agents of the sultans. Through misgovernment and misrule the people suffered much, but the Rumanians continued to struggle hard for the attainment of their freedom. In 1877, when the Russo-Turkish War was raging in the Balkans, the liberty-loving Rumanians cast off the Ottoman yoke and proclaimed their independence on May 10 of that year.

That has become a memorable day in Rumanian history. The Rumanian forces joined the Russians in the war against the Turks, and at the end of that war their newly won independence was recognized by the Congress of Berlin in 1878. Thenceforth they enjoyed freedom for several decades, but their peaceful life was interrupted by many wars, including of course the two world wars. They were involved in both, and they suffered indescribable misery in both.

At the end of the last war they lost part of their territory to the Soviet Union, and they lost their national freedom. A Communist government was forced upon them by the Kremlin, and they had to endure its rigid rule for almost two decades. But in recent years, in response to growing pressures from the freedom-loving Rumanian populace, the Rumanian Communists have been forced to find ways of loosening Moscow's rigidity and thus partly free Rumania from Moscow's close supervision. This response to pressure from the people of Rumania has succeeded in introducing some freedom in many spheres, including foreign trade and internal affairs. Fortunately, an open clash with the Soviet Union has been avoided. In its moves, Rumania has been remarkably successful and has not roused the wrath of the Soviet government. However, the Rumanian people want full freedom, and let us hope that they will attain their goal without involving the country in a war. That is our wish for the Rumanian people on their Independence Day, and I am indeed pleased to join them in the observance of the anniversary of that memorable day.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LXI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, compulsory military service not only results in a severe deprivation of civil liberties, but it is also a grievous departure from this Nation's most cherished heritage—that of personal freedom. Rising public anxiety about such violations, as well as the obvious inequities in the present Selective Service System, has led many private citizens to speak out against the draft and demand its abolition. One such individual is Dr. Joseph McMurray, president of Queens College. In a speech delivered to a conference on the draft sponsored by the American Veterans Committee, President McMurray spoke of conscription being undemocratic in any form and urged the adoption of a voluntary army. Furthermore, he called for the limitation of unneeded military occupations and the making of military service more attractive through increased remuneration and educational benefits. Because of the significance of Dr. McMurray's remarks, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues the full text of his statement, as follows:

THE DRAFT AND FREEDOM (By Joseph McMurray)

I have, as you know, proposed a volunteer army as a means of ending the draft in the United States. I am glad to be here today at the invitation of Gus Tyler to put that suggestion before you. I am here on my day off—the College offices are closed in observance of Veterans Day. What I have to say is not the official opinion at Queens College, nor is there such an opinion. I speak as an individual but I know that my concern reflects the widespread interest among college and university people in the draft.

My suggestion should not convey with it any sense of opposition to the policies of President Johnson and our government in their conduct of the war in Vietnam. I have known President Johnson for many years. I know his desire to do his best. I know his patriotism. I think that if I had all the facts that are available to him that I might well make exactly the same decisions he has made. I support President Johnson and I want to make this clear to you first of all. This is not meant on my part to be a discussion of Vietnam, and in the event that my speech is reported in the press, I hope this will be made clear.

Like you, like President Johnson, I have been disturbed by the draft. An entire generation of Americans has grown up under a system of military conscription. I am disturbed, deeply disturbed, when our young men and women make heroes out of those who evade service to their country. This is the state of patriotism we find ourselves in today.

It is said that the issue of enforced military conscription has nothing to do anymore with freedom. As distinguished a writer as Hanson Baldwin wrote that the draft's un-American aspects do not "play a major role in suggestions for reform." Chairman Rivers, in his opening remarks to the House Committee on Armed Services said, "The facts appear abundantly clear—we do need a draft law for now and the foreseeable future."

Psychologically, slowly, inexorably we are being told that there is no turning back.

Even many of the most sincere and outspoken opponents to the draft only advocate alternatives that are just as involuntary. Some propose lotteries, as if a machine could better dispense justice. Others propose vari-

ous forms of universal service to the government. Still others confuse the draft issue with civil rights. One of the most emotionally-charged arguments against the present system of Selective Service today is that it discriminates against the poor who often are Negroes. No facts that I have seen bear this out.

Many rise up against the present system because they say students go scot free. As a matter of fact, 57% of men deferred for college eventually serve.

The old saw about "citizen soldiers" gets resurrected every week or so to support the "common defense" rationale of enforced service. This takes us back to the frontier. But we are not talking about a citizens army by any stretch of the imagination. Look at the figures. The armed forces number about 3 million. Of that number, only some 300,000 are draftees. Few men in today's army, actually about one-fifth of them, are engaged in combat. While some draw dangerous missions, others are clerks, truck drivers, IBM keypunchers, photographers, typists, accountants, engineers, and the like. We are told that in the army every man is a soldier. I would like to see the army that could put its orderlies into combat.

Men do not serve equally, it is obvious. Nor are they chosen equally, for the selective service system allows for deferments on various grounds, as indeed it must. General Hershey's facetious remark in a hearing about the lottery calling up a man with no legs quickly establishes that—for one reason or another—some are going to be more equal than others.

My suggestion for ridding us of the draft came about, in part, because I do not believe in a world without alternatives. No plan is perfect and time makes us judge our plans against new backdrops. You cannot put your foot into the same stream twice Heraclitus told us. So I believe we are wrong, ladies and gentlemen, to accept alternatives to the draft or the draft itself without first examining the basic argument. Do we, in the United States today, need to put our young men into what, in strong and plain language, must be seen as involuntary servitude?

I think the basic issues of the draft can be discussed on two grounds. The first is on the ground of freedom, which is most important, and the second is on the ground of the draft's economic meanings.

Men should not be coerced into service to their country, barring the most calamitous circumstances. We are not in those circumstances, as Secretary McNamara made quite clear from his statement about lowering the draft call the other day. I just read in this morning's *Post* that Mr. McNamara wants civilians to be drafted even if there are enough volunteers to meet manpower requirements in the Armed Forces. This is healthier for us, he argues because it civilianizes the army and keeps the military from being separate.

One might as well propose that we sentence everyone to terms of hard labor in schoolrooms, police stations, and city rooms because teachers, police, newsmen exercise a potent influence over American life that conceivably might be abused.

Well, I am for civilian review of the police and the military and I am for public accountability from the press and from educators.

But it is simply silly to think that a few hapless 19 year olds can mold the military establishment.

Mr. McNamara's argument for the continuation of the draft is another example of the blinders that constrict our view of the Selective Service Act.

Men should not be deprived of their liberties, their choices of careers, or their choices of action in order to satisfy the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the admirals, the Congress, or even the President of the United States, unless clearly there is no other way—and I stress that phrase—no other way to insure the security of the nation.

The Selective Service system has been admired by its head as a "channeler" of men. General Hershey said before a Congressional committee "... we have channeled people into training for occupations and professions that were said to be very necessary in national life. ... I have no idea how many people we are deferring that may well be as immediately involved in survival as the people who are in uniform ... in fact, it takes 85% of our time" the General continued, "with the people we are trying to encourage to go into professions and occupations and training for those by deferring them ..."

Any system that takes people into involuntary servitude either by putting them into uniforms or by forcing them into occupations is unjust.

Such a system, defended on the grounds of justice and fairness, in the words of President Brewster of Yale, "tarnishes our national spirit" and suggests that the only way to serve humanity is "to repudiate your country."

The conscription of men in any form, under any system, raises a question of freedom in the United States and I shall not be brainwashed to think otherwise.

The draft is economically wasteful and economically unfair.

To draft about 300,000 men a year primarily into the Army, has required an enormous bureaucracy. I quote from the Selective Service Act some of the jobs that have sprung into being to feed these men into the Army: registrars, local boards, appeal boards, medical advisors to local boards, medical advisors to State Directors, advisors to registrars, interpreters. All of these people, and some are volunteers, make telephone calls, have office or meeting quarters, print materials, travel, and eat. The 1964 cost of this great "channeling" machine was in excess of \$40 million.

One interesting expenditure of time is this. The Director of Selective Service in each state, in the words of General Hershey, is "almost constantly cancelling inductions so that people can enlist." You know, of course, that the law does not permit a man to enlist for three years when he has been called for two.

Delays in such a system are bound to be costly and common. Out of a pool of 990,000 men available as of May 1, only 71,000 had been examined and certified fit. The draft took 17,000 men from Michigan and only 15,000 from Texas—a state with 2.55 million more people—in the same period of time. Turnover must be very costly. Each year, 400,000 men retire, most of whom are draftees whose reenlistment rate is only 8%.

The process of the draft is mostly one of elimination and rejection rather than recruitment. Out of every ten men who reach the age of 26, 3 are drafted, 3 enlist, 3 are rejected, and one is deferred as a student or for some other reason. As I said before, most students eventually serve. On the initial examination at 18 years of age, 58% are rejected. With so many men, some figures estimate as many as 45% of the 18 year old population who never serve, the system becomes honeycombed with exemptions and exceptions. The situation is not helped in its efficiency by 4,000 local boards, each with considerable autonomy, administering the law.

There is a lot of economic unfairness about the draft. John Galbraith said that the draft is a "device" by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee. "Presumably," he concludes, "freedom of choice here as elsewhere would be worth paying for ..."

The men who are presently drafted are forced to subsidize by their lost time and their lost wages the costs of defending their country. Why should we expect men in the

armed forces to bear the greatest expense at the same time we expect them to bear the greatest danger? Freedom must have its own motives. Freedom must supply men with incentives and rewards for behavior or government becomes a punishing and coercive force.

I believe that rewards and pride are better than bondage. I propose that men be recruited into the armed forces by means of attractive benefits. Some of these benefits might be in the form of salary. One could expect a soldier to earn at least as much as a new police officer, yet he does not even after long years of service.

Benefits might take the form of bonds or other savings put away during the man's service and payable to him later in life. Educational benefits were cited in a recent Defense Department study as one of the key reasons for enlistment. A guarantee of future educational opportunity in a college or vocational school would be a cogent argument for enlistment.

I have no doubt but that the \$40 million budget of the Selective Service operation could fund a successful recruitment campaign for the armed services.

When I first mentioned this idea of a volunteer army in a Commencement Address last June, I supposed it not to be original—which it is not—but an opinion that was in circulation and that was receiving or would receive consideration. I offered the idea as a citizen, not as an expert, and I expected perhaps naively that any alternative in favor of freedom would receive priority of consideration. I regret to say that this does not seem to be the case.

General Hershey said quite bluntly, "Any person I can get in the Armed Forces that comes for pay alone, I don't want." I have reported to you the eroding pressure put upon us to think only in terms of other methods of conscription. In press reports about the Pentagon study of the draft, Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris is said to have testified, and I quote, "Neither improved pay nor fringe benefits would help enough to do away with the draft." Another account reported Mr. Morris as follows: "In discounting the prospects of ending the draft, Morris noted that even by raising pay and other benefits to the tune of \$17 billion a year, the Pentagon would be 'theoretically' unable to maintain a force of 2.7 million men, the pre-Viet level."

I next read, on July 3, of the President's appointment of a 20 member panel headed by IBM General Counsel Burke Marshall with a "broad mandate" to study the Selective Service System and make a recommendation by January 1. In *The New York Times* account of that appointment, I was surprised by the fact that not once was the prospect of ending the draft so much as mentioned.

I draw to your attention right now that this panel may never even consider the elimination of the draft.

Mr. McNamara, according to a *Reporter* magazine piece by Bruce Chapman, gave two estimates of the additional cost of an all-volunteer army. One estimate was \$4 billion; it was made in February. The second was \$20 billion, made in December. You have heard Mr. Morris' estimate of \$17 billion.

The ease with which these billions slip through the rooms of the Pentagon inclines me to agree with Mr. Chapman when he writes, "... the Department of Defense has either found the computation of cost of this alternative to the draft inordinately complicated or has not given it serious consideration."

I should like the idea of a volunteer army to have the serious attention and consideration it deserves. Will it cost billions? Yes, freedom is expensive and our own freedom is as expensive and as precious and as worth investing in as any freedom we have paid for in the past. It might cost as much as \$300 million per State, a small percentage of our gross national product, to keep men

out of a state of involuntary servitude. What is our money for if it cannot keep us free?

But let us begin to at least plan for an end to the draft. Let us stop deluding ourselves that more conscription will solve the problems of unfair conscription or that teaching in Brooklyn or in Mississippi are viable alternatives to service in a combat area.

Let us stop teaching our young men how to "cop out" in cynical avoidance of military service. In some situations, every man may be called to patriotic service. But until those situations are clearly before us, let us not confuse patriotism with adherence to an outmoded bureaucracy.

Our young men and women love their country. They have shown us that in their acts of conscience, in their urban corps, in their teacher corps, in their tutoring of the young, in their fight for minority rights and in their willingness to sometimes die in that fight.

I propose an alternative to a system that has made military service a shameful act and a place for the unlucky or the unwanted. I propose that we honor the men who serve their society by protecting it by treating them with the compassion of an abundant and a grateful society. Men will risk death for us and they will risk it voluntarily as the long histories of the armed forces, the police, and the fire departments of this country have proven. We must provide all of these men with the benefits due their hard and difficult work.

I ask you and I ask those in our government responsible for these matters to turn away from coercion and force. I ask that every effort be made immediately to study ways of reducing and eventually eliminating the numbers of men taken into service against their wills.

I ask that every man and woman serve our nation with the right to choose the form of service he or she shall give, as fits a nation of free men and women.

GORDON McLENDON

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, Gordon McLendon, head of the well-known broadcasting organization, recently challenged the music industry either to clean up some of their lyrics or desist sending to stations records that many listeners hold objectionable. The national press, as well as broadcasters across the country, were quick to acknowledge this unprecedented move. It is the natural fear of most broadcasters that they must play what is selling, regardless of what is in good taste, for fear they will lose out to an unscrupulous competitor.

All the more reason that Gordon McLendon and his staff should be commended. Their unprecedented courage in assuming such community responsibility should be an example for the music industry to follow.

I know the Members of this body will share my interest in McLendon's open letter to the music industry, as it appeared in Broadcasting on April 10, 1967, and a number of articles and letters in response:

AN OPEN LETTER TO: THE MUSIC INDUSTRY

Frankly, we're tired . . .

Tired of today's new releases coming

through rife with "raunchy" lyrics, et cetera. In the past month, six records which were on the national charts far overstepped the boundaries of good taste, and we were forced to ban them.

Tired of "policing" your industry. It is time consuming, not our responsibility, and an outright imposition—on all broadcasters.

Tired of answering complaints from our listeners, civic groups, and civic leaders who blame us for your poor judgment on what is, and what is not, in good taste.

Tired of sincerely promising the FCC that we will do everything to elevate the needs, tastes and desires of the community—only to have one or two records threaten to tear it all down.

Therefore, we intend to—

1. Refuse to review effective May 15, 1967 any record submitted to us for air play unless it is accompanied by a valid and actual lyric sheet for both sides.

2. Refuse to play record releases which continue, through "gimmicks," intonations, and nuances to either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste.

3. Refuse consideration of both sides of a record if one side is adjudged unfit for airplay.

4. Urge all responsible broadcasters to follow this "code of record standards" in reviewing records in the future.

Frankly, we are tired. We want to be fair. But our success, after all, is often dependent on your success as record producers; but conversely, your success is predicated on radio airplay of your product. Please, let's work together. Clean things up before some unnecessary regulatory action is taken or before the broadcaster's listening audience indignantly tunes out.

THE McLENDON STATIONS.

LIFE LINE

This is "Life Line," Melvin Munn from Dallas.

There is nothing basically wrong with sophistication, modern viewpoints, and changes in our culture so long as our open society is allowed to retain its affection for good taste. There is no reason why art, films, books, and music must dredge in stagnate waters of our English language in order to turn up words and phrases that shock and startle the listener. Almost every language on earth has its colorful and bawdy expressions to be used in verbal assaults upon everything from the Andean Llama of South America, to the Missouri mule, to the balky space rocket, and to the man next door who lets his sprinkler block your driveway! There are words that ought to be left scrawled on the alley fence or allowed to drop on the floor during live conversation. There are also words that have no place in books, magazines and papers which are intended for family reading.

I am told that my hearing is excellent and I find no difficulty in being able to hear clearly most things that occur in sound of me. I do, however, have one problem. I find it extremely difficult to translate some of the vocal sounds made by singers who are competing with rock 'n roll bands on the stage and recordings. It may well be because I do not hear enough of this type of music to be able to interpret the words, but I'm also convinced that I don't understand many of the lyrics simply because the music is over-shadowing the singer. Still, I find that young people have a keen ear since this is their favorite kind of popular tune. As a result, the youth often understands lyrics to a new song much better than does the adult. Thus, if there is an obscene, indecent, or off-color word or phrase in the lyrics the youngster generally recognizes it at once.

There are many rock 'n roll tunes that have quality, depth, and appeal. The lyrics of many such tunes express a reasonable thought with some clarity. On the other hand, a great many lyrics make little or no

sense even to the most faithful devotee. Still other lyrics are downright objectionable and have no place on the broadest airwaves or on the home record player. There are probably several million American homes today with youngsters having in their record collection vocalists singing lyrics parents would not permit if they knew some of the words the singer was using.

I have been in and around the record, radio, and television industries for a lot of years. With very few exceptions these powerful elements in our American life are managed by responsible and honorable people. For many years the broadcasting industry has policed itself with a broadcasting code that has protected the listening public from much of the cheap and the vulgar. That is also true of the record industry. However, zeal, enthusiasm, and the pressure of daily work sometimes results in temporary lapses of responsibility and judgment essential to the preservation of good taste.

Perhaps that has happened in the record business. In any case, the recording industry does need to take a second and third look at some of the cheap and vulgar material occasionally released on record.

In that direction comes now a broadcasting pioneer, both a firm and its founder widely known for courage and imagination. The McLendon Stations is a corporate name for the firm that owns a number of radio stations throughout the United States. On page 39 of Broadcasting Magazine for April 1, 1967, there appeared a full page ad. The ad speaks for itself and it speaks for the McLendon Stations. It is an open letter to the music industry and reads as follows:

"Frankly, we're tired . . .

"Tired of today's new releases coming through rife with 'raunchy' lyrics, et cetera. In the past month, six records which were on the national charts far overstepped the boundaries of good taste, and we were forced to ban them.

"Tired of 'policing' your industry. It is time consuming, not our responsibility, and an outright imposition—on all broadcasters.

"Tired of answering complaints from our listeners, civic groups, and civic leaders who blame us for your poor judgment on what is, and what is not, in good taste.

"Tired of sincerely promising the FCC that we will do everything to elevate the needs, tastes and desires of the community—only to have one or two records threaten to tear it all down.

"Therefore, we intend to

"1. Refuse to review effective May 15, 1967 any record submitted to us for air play unless it is accompanied by a valid and actual lyric sheet for both sides.

"2. Refuse to play record releases which continue, through 'gimmicks,' intonations, and nuances to either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste.

"3. Refuse consideration of both sides of a record if one side is adjudged unfit for airplay.

"4. Urge all responsible broadcasters to follow this 'code of record standards' in reviewing records in the future.

"Frankly, we are tired. We want to be fair. But our success, after all, is often dependent on your success as record producers; but conversely, your success is predicated on radio airplay of your product. Please, let's work together. Clean things up before some unnecessary regulatory action is taken or before the broadcasters' listening audience indignantly tunes out."

And that ad is signed the McLendon Stations.

The McLendon organization operates radio stations in Dallas, Buffalo, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, San Francisco.

I want to salute Mr. Gordon McLendon, his staff, and his station personnel for the dignity, clarity, and professional responsi-

bility inherent in this new code of record standards. The relationships between the broadcasting station and the general public will continue to be pleasant and beneficial if radio and television broadcasters will insist upon a fair level of decency in every song they broadcast. It would be most unfortunate if objectionable song lyrics sank so low as to force the public to demand federal government intervention.

MOST LABELS DENOUNCE McLENDON CHAIN EDICT

(By Dave Finkle)

The McLendon Stations announced last week that after May 15 all singles submitted for airplay must be accompanied by copies of "valid" and "actual" lyrics for both sides of the single.

(They also announced that their eight affiliated AM and FM stations would not play records which "either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste" and they would not consider either side of a single for play "if one side is adjudged unfit for airplay.")

The record company reaction, polled by *Record World*, to the demand for lyrics was varied, with only one company—United Artists—deciding to send the lyrics from the home office.

The UA feeling was that their promotion department exists in part to service disk jockeys, and if certain disk jockeys require lyrics, they would receive them.

MGM also seemed to be of a mind to give the McLendon stations what they want. Distributors locally who hand out the deejay singles, it was explained, would be fulfilling the request.

GENERALLY UNRECEPTIVE

Most of the other companies queried were unreceptive to the idea for a variety of reasons, which ranged from the expense of "going into the printing business" to sentiment that stations are lucky to get so much free product without making further demands.

Most company spokesmen stated that stations should decide whether or not to play a record by listening to it and if they don't like what they hear or suspect that what they hear is objectionable, they should veto it.

A prevalent quote (paraphrased) was: We censor our own records; so we don't need to send out accompanying proof.

One label executive felt that stations should not consider themselves censors at all, that if they profess to be playing best-selling records, they should plan their playlists by sales reports solely.

The play list of records is being carefully perused visually and aurally for overt and covert meretricious expression. And, of course, the problem of obscenity or questionable taste is an extremely moot one in these days of LSD obsession, when just about every obtrusive word or phrase is immediately assumed to be hoodwinking argot.

The McLendon stations include KLIF and KNUS-FM-Dallas; KILT and KOST-FM-Houston; KTSA-San Antonio; KABL-AM-FM-Oakland-San Francisco; WYSL-AM-FM-Buffalo; and WNUS-AFM-FM-Chicago.

Barton R. McLendon is Chairman and Gordon B. McLendon is President.

[From *Billboard*, Apr. 22, 1967]

HAIL McLENDON

EDITOR: To the McLendon radio stations: Your statement of policy in the April 8 issue is both courageous and necessary. I only wish that copies of your statement could be nationally publicized on a vast enough scale to encourage those who have felt that they alone were disturbed by current trends, both in and out of the music field. Thank you.

Mrs. Joan R. Ernst.

PALM BEACH, FLA.

EDITOR: Regards McLendon's open letter. WGH radio concurs. The broadcasting indus-

try is much too late in taking a stand on this issue.

ROGER CLARK,
WGH Program Director.

NEWPORT NEWS, VA.

[From *Newsweek*, May 8, 1967]

PURGE

When an executive for the McLendon Corp.'s radio-station chain found his 9-year-old daughter last month with a Rolling Stones record called "Let's Spend the Night Together," he followed his impulse and slashed its grooves with a can opener. His second thought was to convince his boss, Dallas-based Gordon B. McLendon, to launch a morality campaign against "dirty lyrics" in pop music.

McLendon obliged. In full-page ads appearing in broadcast trade magazines, the chain owner popped off loud and clear: "We're tired of today's new releases coming through rife with raunchy lyrics." He also stridently urged other broadcasters to go along with him in a purge of records which through "intonations and nuances either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste."

Suiting action to words, the McLendon Corp.'s six stations have already purged themselves of the Beatles' "Penny Lane" for its cockney earthiness, "Candy Man" by the Nitty Gritty Dirt Band for a casual reference to God, and a funky little number by Mitch Ryder and the Detroit Wheels called "Sock It to Me Baby."

Although McLendon was soon joined by the six outlets of the Susquehanna Broadcasting Stations in Pennsylvania, the immediate reaction from the recording industry was a loud guffaw. "Ridiculous," said a spokesman for Capitol Records which had orders for more than a million "Penny Lanes" even before it was released. "When the Beatles make a record, the kids know about it and they buy it." "Rock and Roll has always been raunchy," adds Richard Goldstein, a music critic for New York's *World Journal Tribune*. "That's what it's all about. It's got a special code and a lot of kids understand it. It's made for that purpose."

All stations, of course, exercise record censorship when the leeries get too lusty. But few have exercised so heavy a hand as the McLendon chain. "The hippies know what they're saying on these records," snorts Bill Young, program director at McLendon's KILT in Houston. "But ole John Q. Public doesn't. We're tired of them putting it over on ole John Q."

IMMORAL RECORDS BANNED BY McLENDON RADIO GROUP

(By Ben Gross)

At last something is being done about it . . . and it's about time! The McLendon group of radio stations, extending all the way from Buffalo to San Francisco, is banning all recordings (mostly rock 'n' roll) with lyrics "that are immoral or in bad taste."

In full page advertisements appearing in two trade magazines, this company announced that, effective May 15, it will not review any platter submitted for air play "unless it is accompanied by a valid and actual lyric sheet for both sides."

Also, it will refuse to play the record releases which continue "through gimmicks, intonations and nuances to offend public morals, dignity or taste; either innocently or intentionally."

Too, these stations will not air either side of a disk if one side is "adjudged unfit for air play."

A WELCOME MOVE

This action on the part of a progressive group of independent stations will be welcomed by parents, teachers and all lovers of good popular music. For years, certain manu-

facturers of recordings, especially the fly-by-nights, have been getting away with murder. That is, the murder of all decencies and sensibilities.

In the name of the "new music" and the "new freedom of youth," too many lyrics have been not only off-color in a subtle sort of way but openly dirty in a coarse and leering manner.

Those who have ventured to criticize these excremental songs have often been attacked as old fogies, fuddy-duddies and—horror of horrors—as squares. We have been told that they, far from being "in," are hopelessly "out" . . . social pariahs who're simply "not with it."

Gordon B. McLendon, president of the chain, and the father of four children ranging from 15 to 22, gave a cogent explanation of his action: "I have been disturbed at the lyrics and sounds of many records popular with the youth of America. I think these are morally damaging and I have ordered all our stations to ban this type of recording. But it is up to the record industry to police itself, not up to the broadcaster."

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 17, 1967.

To: The music industry.

From: The Susquehanna stations.

Subject: Your poor taste.

We thought we were alone with the problem. So . . . our hats are off to The McLendon Stations for publicly airing their concern in *Billboard*.

We, too, spend too much time with the evidence of your bad taste. Lyrics, song titles, offensive vocal sounds, and even names of the performing groups have moved from the clever and creative to the crude and outrageous.

If you are trying to find out if you can get away with it . . . you can't. We, along with other responsible broadcasters, are blowing the whistle.

We join with The McLendon Stations in:

1. Requiring—a lyric sheet with records submitted for air-play.

2. Continuing—to refuse records if either side offends public morals by title, lyrics, or group name.

3. Urging—all responsible broadcasters to publicly set the same standards.

Yours is a great industry. So is ours. We plan to keep ours that way by respecting the dignity and taste of the people who have made us great . . . our listeners.

How about you?

THE SUSQUEHANNA STATIONS.

[From Bill Gavin's record report No. 642, *Weekly Summary*, San Francisco, Calif., April 7, 1967]

ON THE RECORD

The April 8 issue of *Billboard* offers broadcasters more than the normal amount of interesting reading.

We were also struck by the full page, in the same *Billboard* issue, taken out by the McLendon stations as an open letter to the record companies. The letter objects to suggestive song lyrics. It reflects the opinions of many broadcasters. It is hardly necessary to point out that responsibility for the influx of questionable records does not lie with the record business as a whole, but only with the comparatively few manufacturers who have sacrificed good taste to good profit. The venality of a small minority should not be used to reflect discredit on the entire record industry.

In the final analysis, each broadcaster is responsible, not for the records he receives, but for those that he puts on the air. Radio consistently rejects a vast majority of the records submitted each week for shortcomings of quality and/or content. Radio is never demeaned by the inferior level of the records that are auditioned; each radio sta-

tion tells it like it is by the records played for its listeners.

The admonitions in the McLendon letter might, with somewhat greater relevance, be applied to those radio people—program directors, music directors and DJ's—who interpret a station's ethical standards by what they put on the air.

AMERICAN MOTHERS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM STEWART,
McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. STEWART: It was pleasant to talk with you today, and to know that you can participate in the Panel Discussion scheduled for May 10th at luncheon 12:30 noon in the Astor Gallery, Waldorf-Astoria. The subject is—"In our complex society what can inspired individual leadership achieve toward strengthening the home, the community and the nation?"

Mrs. Harold V. Milligan will moderate the panel. This discussion follows the morning session devoted to the Young Mother Council Service. We hope that you will attend the luncheon as our guest.

The response of thousands of mothers to our "Mothers Manifesto" indicates the concern felt by the public. Your leadership indicates clearly what individuals can do when sufficiently motivated. We hope that your contribution will not only reveal what you have accomplished but will be so directed as to stimulate our audience to greater dedication.

I enclose some background material for your information. The other panel members are distinguished leaders of accomplishment.

Best wishes.

Cordially,

MR. DOROTHY LEWIS,
President.

POLK BROS.,
Joliet, Ill., April 5, 1967.

GENTLEMEN: Just a little acknowledgement of your full-page announcement in Billboard concerning the vulgarity that has become rampant in today's song lyrics. I for one couldn't be more gratified that someone has finally taken an important step forward in the morass we call modern-day music; a stand against the gradual degradation of our culture; a positive move toward restoring a sense of decency and morality to current popular music.

Our young people in this day and age find it hard enough to distinguish between what is good and what is bad, what with all the promiscuous movies, to shows, and magazines that prevail everywhere. The music business should take it upon itself to at least provide one haven from the barrage of "Sex at any Price" purveyors seeking to warp the minds of our youth and the whole basis of our social and moral structure.

As Record Dept. manager, I have long been appalled at the lack of discretion shown by the promoters of off-color lyrics and dirty meanings in today's pop songs, and I sincerely hope your courageous action will encourage a more active participation by everyone concerned in promoting a greater sense of decency and responsibility in the music business.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL LAPIKAS.

THE MCLENDON STATIONS MEMORANDUM,
APRIL 11, 1967

To: Bill Stewart.
From: Bill Young.
Subject: Billboard ad.

More reaction to the Billboard ad!

Chuck just talked to Juggy Gayle (Promo man for Atlantic) and he said that Atlantic is making arrangements now to comply with the lyric sheet requirement.

He also said that the line "sock it to me,

Baby" has been edited out of the new Aretha Franklin single "Respect". This cut has been pulled from her LP, but because of the ad, will be edited for release!

Apparently, we are making our point.

DICK DALE ENTERPRISES, INC.,
Hollywood, Calif., April 7, 1967.

Mr. GORDON MCLENDON,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. MCLENDON: Read your open letter to the Music Industry in the April issue of the Billboard and I agree with you 100%.

I knew sooner or later some one of importance would have the guts to tell the music producers to clean house. I have been in the music business for many years and have noticed the downward trend of music in the past several years, especially the titles which have double meaning. It was bad enough we had to put up with the long hairs and the uncouth scene. I can see in the near future a change for the best if many music producers follow your example. I, for one, will do my part to produce the better type of music as I have been doing in the past on our Del-Tone Record label and also our Cougar Record label.

Please feel free to call me at any time, if I can help in any way to help the drive you have started. If every producer in every area takes notice, the music industry can thank you for spear-heading this drive for better music.

Soon to follow this letter will be our new release on Cougar Records which we believe is the better type of music. This record was turned down by the major stations in Los Angeles. My guess is because it is too clean and is good music. I am led to believe if we want to get a hit record we must make it dirty. I say, hell will freeze over before we go that route.

Please keep up the good work and I'm sure the major stations will soon wake up to the fact there is good music to be heard.

Warmest Regards,

JIM MONSOUR,
President.

ADAMS-ETHRIDGE PUBLISHING CO., BMI,
Galveston, Tex., April 3, 1967.

Mr. GORDON MCLENDON,
The McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. MCLENDON: You are to be commended for your ad appearing in the April 8 issue of Billboard. The situation in our business has been heartbreaking to the serious producer for the past few years.

We have a release out now featuring Roy Montague on Columbia Records. We realize his potential, and we went all out on the production, with the Anita Kerr Singers, strings, the best arranger, Bill Walker. Roy will be the next big recording star of the Jim Reeves, Eddy Arnold style.

Yet we have been turned down for airtime on many stations including your KILT, even though I made a personal trip to the Program Director, Mr. Dunaway. Yet a great piece of trash, Sock It To Me, Baby, is getting fantastic air time on KILT.

I hope to see national results on your stand. In the meantime, I am re-submitting our release to your stations as outlined in your policy.

Sincerely,

LEON ETHRIDGE.

AVCO BROADCASTING CORP.,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM STEWART,
National Program Director,
The McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR BILL: I have your letter of April 20, and the attached repro of your April 10, 1967 Broadcasting Ad. In direct answer to your question regarding my feelings, I concur completely.

The problem is not an especially serious

one to WWDC which, for the lack of a better description, is a swinging middle-of-the-road station. Since we regularly exercise subjective discretion over the list of records we play, we can, and do, simply avoid records which fit the descriptions in your Ad.

At my former association, WPTR, which was, for the lack of a better description, a top-40 station, the problem was far more acute. There, the dilemma of being required to play the top records of the day and yet recognizing the "put on" or worse, of some of the records we were playing was quite apparent to us.

WPTR's Program Director, Dick Lawrence, and myself discussed this at considerable length just prior to my leaving. I am, therefore, taking the liberty of sending a carbon copy of my letter to him and, in closing, your letter and repro for his consideration.

Irv Lichtenstein, WWDC's Program Director, to whom you also sent this correspondence, asked me to tell you that he too is in agreement. Please let me know if there is any way further we can help.

Kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

PERRY S. SAMUELS.

[From Variety Apr. 26, 1967]

MCLENDON STATION EXEC HITS BRITISH
LACQUER LEERICS

Two centuries ago a warning cry went out "The British are coming!" Today a cry in the broadcasting industry is "Stop the British . . . from influencing American music with their out-and-out 'single' entendres," so declares McLendon Stations' national program director Bill Stewart.

Radio chain, with headquarters in Dallas, is the first to go on record against the increasing "Gimmicks, intonations and nuances innocently or intentionally offending public morals, dignity and taste" through the new wave of lyrics in certain songs.

BLASTS BEATLES

"The English, spearheaded by The Beatles, are continuously injecting these suggestive lines that ultimately will bring strong censorship by the U.S. government, not just the broadcast industry alone," Stewart asserted. Stewart reports within six months between 25 and 30 top recordings have been banned by his stations because of the "tone of the words."

Starting May 15, all diskeries must submit separate lyric sheets before wax will be aired.

"If we keep getting titles like 'Fish And Finger Pie' and 'Let's Spend The Night Together Baby' and such lines within the songs themselves like 'sock it to me, baby' and '40,000 purple holes in my arm' the time to stop is now," Stewart warned. Another English group he charges is an offender is The Rolling Stones.

Stewart went on to say that "they (pop-rock English groups) are just having too much influence, and are making an impact on the diskers and record manufacturers in this country."

Stewart says "most other broadcasters concur with what we have to say and the stand we are taking." The Susquehanna Broadcasting Co., which controls six top-40 stations, he asserts is lending "support" to the crusade started by McLendon.

"Many of the major record companies are behind us in our thoughts, but there are still some which are objectionable in misconstruing this as being censorship of free expression. We sincerely mean our 'code of record standards' as a better guideline for the companies and performers alike.

"We've had all we can take of this glorifying of LSD and hop."

AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: We ask your cooperation in assisting us to handle a problem of concern

to both the record and broadcast industries: the screening of records which contain lyrics in bad taste.

Initially, we want to reaffirm our basic position: this station will not play records whose lyrics, in our sole opinion, violate the tenets of good taste.

We try to screen all new record releases for possible inclusion on our weekly play list. Many records contain lyrics which are clearly and easily distinguishable by listening to them. Our problem does not involve these records, since if the lyrics are deemed to be in bad taste, the specific record will not be broadcast by our station.

The problem area involves those records in which the lyrics are not clearly and easily understandable in the initial screening. Effective immediately, in such instances we ask you to furnish us (at the same time you furnish the record) with a copy of the lyrics actually used on the particular record furnished.

If there is the slightest doubt whatsoever that the lyrics on your record are not clearly distinguishable, we suggest that you attach a copy of the lyrics used, because if the station cannot understand the lyrics, and there is no transcript attached, that record will not be considered for broadcast by this station.

Thus, in any situation in which there is the slightest doubt, you must include a transcript of the lyrics if you wish to protect your record's opportunity for equal consideration with all other records for inclusion on our play list.

We believe the foregoing procedures will enable us to implement our obligation to broadcast in the public interest and will be extremely helpful to both the record and broadcast industries in maintaining the high standards observed by the overwhelming majority of those engaged in our business.

We hope all responsible record companies will cooperate with us in this endeavor.

Very truly yours,

WALTER A. SCHWARTZ,
Vice President and General Manager.

WLCY RADIO,
Tampa, Fla., April 25, 1967.

Mr. BILL STEWART,
National Program Director,
The McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR BILL: Thanks for your note. It's been a lot of years since we've been in touch.

Bill, I posted your ad when it appeared in the trades for staff and management opinion. The response was one of relief: "Thank God somebody's taking a stand."

We do not air records with suggestive lyrics, naturally, and it would certainly ease our load (and ears) not to have to play and replay a record while writing down the lyrics.

I thought I was the only blue nose in the world who wouldn't play the flip of a record like the Rolling Stones' last one—I'm glad to hear I'm not alone: Those kids buy a record on our say-so and play both sides when they get it home. And what really bugs me is that one of the network-owned major labels is in it deep. I asked one of that label's regional men if he'd have his 14 year old daughter come over to my office and let me talk dirty to her for an hour or so. He got the point.

Cordials,

ROY E. NELSON,
Operations Manager.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 23, 1967 BY THE
LOUISIANA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS
MEETING IN SHREVEPORT, LA.

Whereas there is an apparent increase in the amount of salacious and immoral material being included in records distributed to all stations, and

Whereas the broadcasting industry has no control over the production and distribution

of records and must use recorded music made available to it;

Now therefore be it resolved that this Association concurs with Gordon McLendon in his contention that the industry responsible for the production and distribution of this music should show more concern about the nature of the music and lyrics produced, and

Be it further resolved that we compliment Mr. McLendon for taking this courageous stand and making his voice heard.

REMARKS BY DR. JOSE A. MORA, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the first of May, the distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Dr. Jose A. Mora, delivered a very eloquent and significant address at the annual dinner of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. This great Organization of American States has done much to promote the peace and prosperity of the Western Hemisphere in years past. We know that its role in the progress and peace of the Western Hemisphere in the years ahead shall be even greater. Dr. Jose A. Mora, distinguished statesman, as Secretary General, has immeasurably contributed to the accomplishments of the Organization of American States. We, of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, were highly honored to have him appear at this function, and were particularly pleased to hear Dr. Irving Muskat speak so favorably of the great Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, known as Interama, located in my district in Miami, and to have his recognition of the part that the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center will play in future years in bringing closer together in friendship, and in cooperation, the peace-loving nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I commend Dr. Mora's able address to my colleagues and fellow countrymen and include it in the body of the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, DR. JOSE A. MORA, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE FLORIDA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

It is indeed a pleasure to be present upon the occasion of the annual dinner of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce here in Washington, and to find myself in the company of so many friends of long standing.

Over the many years I have spent in this country, first as Ambassador of Uruguay, and more recently as Secretary General of the Organization of American States, I have been in unusually frequent contact with the State of Florida.

Some of my experience, of course, stems from the fact that Florida is in a very literal sense the United States' gateway to the south—the point of passage for thousands of travelers between this country and Latin America.

Much more is involved than mere geographical proximity, however.

The ties between Florida and the lands of the Caribbean date, as you all know, from the earliest years of our recorded history. The first European settlement in United States territory, Saint Augustine, was not English-speaking, but Spanish-speaking, and throughout the colonial period Florida's contacts were exclusively with the captaincies of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, not with the British establishments to the north.

If the Spaniards went their way a century and a half ago, and their place has been taken by an ever-increasing flood of descendants of the British colonists, their memory lingers on.

To begin with, of course, there is the name of the state, commemorative of its discovery on Easter Sunday, but singularly appropriate in its suggestion of a land of flowers. Then there is the oft-told tale of Ponce de Leon's vain search for the Fountain of Youth. Perhaps that gentleman was not so much misled as ahead of his time: could he return today during the Easter vacation period, and land on the beach at Fort Lauderdale, he would surely be convinced that his goal had been attained!

As befits a race called Conquistadores, the Spanish were great military architects, and the Castillo de San Marcos is a lasting reminder of the first empire on which the sun never set. The restoration of that and other colonial buildings at Saint Augustine, enthusiastically promoted by native Floridians and immigrants from as far off as New England, will bring visitors from all parts of the country to a vivid realization that the American heritage is Iberian as well as British in origin.

However respectful of history they may be, Floridians are not given to living in the past. Indeed, considering the installations at Cape Kennedy, they are in some respects living in the future! Thus, in connection with the Saint Augustine restoration, they have provided a Pan American Center, to further closer relations with Spaniards and Spanish Americans of today. A little farther to the south, a still more ambitious undertaking for the promotion of trade and friendship between the United States and Latin America is coming into being at Miami—the project known as Interama.

The Florida-Colombia Alliance represents one of the outstanding relationships developed under the Partners of the Alliance Program. I had the pleasure of addressing the Conference held in Tampa in November of last year, and was impressed to note that the projects considered ran from agrarian technical assistance to health programs, from tourism to the exchange of students and professors and aid to libraries and educational institutions. I am confident that the activities that have been undertaken will be fruitful, not merely in material benefits to those who are the object of assistance, but also in meaningful personal relationships among the collaborators—one of the firmest bases of inter-American solidarity.

It is indeed encouraging to me, as Secretary General of the OAS, that the fastest-growing state in the East, and one that is in the vanguard of progress, is also a leader in promoting friendship, cooperation, and trade with the United States' neighbors to the south.

I salute the State of Florida—a historic outpost of imperial Spain, the gateway to the adventures of outer space, and a bridge between the peoples and cultures of the New World.

POOR SCHOOLS FIRST

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may

extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Republican efforts to dismantle our current Federal aid to education program are being conducted in the name of "States' rights." Challenging this theory, the St. Petersburg Times points out in an April 29 editorial that without the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the result in States such as Florida "would be a complete reversal of Congress' intent to stimulate better schools. The rich would get more, the poor less."

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the Record at this point:

POOR SCHOOLS FIRST

American governmental progress is marked by a series of great compromises. One of them—deciding the proper role of the federal government in assisting elementary and secondary schools—has fallen into deep trouble.

Every Congress since the end of World War II has heard impassioned debate over federal aid to education. With local and state tax resources consumed by ever-increasing demands, Congress wanted to offer some relief with federal tax dollars. But for two decades, every attempt was stalled by emotion-packed differences between public and religious schools, rural and urban areas, rich and poor states.

It was left for the remarkable 89th Congress to discover an acceptable compromise in 1965. Federal aid was not to go to states, school districts or schools. It was to go to children, specifically children of low-income families. Congress directed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to distribute appropriated funds to state education departments which would in turn apportion moneys to school districts according to a precise formula devised by Congress. The formula is based upon the number of 5 to 17-year-old children in each district from families with incomes below \$2,000 a year, multiplied by 50 per cent of each state's average expenditure per school child. Thus, when state school support rose, so would federal aid.

Aware of the long and bitter struggle on this issue, President Johnson called the Education Act "the most important measure that I shall ever sign."

Supported by the churches, educators, private schools and the public, the program has worked beautifully.

Now, when the 90th Congress must renew the law, a short-sighted group of House Republicans is attempting to throw out the entire compromise. Whether it is their goal or not, these efforts threaten all federal aid to education.

Ironically, the attack is being conducted in the name of states' rights. Instead of states being required to follow Congress' needy children formula, the opponents want to give state education departments the power to distribute the funds as they wish.

The result in states such as Florida, where outdated state school aid formulas actually discourage county support, would be a complete reversal of Congress' intent to stimulate better schools. The rich would get more, the poor less.

Or, if the worst happens, the entire federal program will collapse. So, in the name of states' rights, the Republican House members will have increased the load on state treasuries and on heavily overburdened property taxes.

This must not be allowed to happen. It is to be hoped that Florida's 12 members of the House will help see that it doesn't.

ILLITERACY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 2 million American schoolchildren who do not speak English and who, as a direct result, suffer in terms of the educational opportunities available to them, in terms of being able to compete effectively for jobs upon graduation, and in terms of social standing in their communities. Unable to communicate in the language of the mainstream of American life, they have been cut off from effective participation in their society by an invisible but real barrier of verbs and nouns, idiom and nuance.

In my own New York there are more than 67,000 such children, less than 1,000 of whom graduate each year from an academic high school. Although the vast majority of these children in New York are of Puerto Rican heritage, the school age, non-English-speaking children in New York cut across 74 different locales and speak 32 distinct languages.

For one child to be deprived of his birthright of equal opportunity as an American citizen because of inadequate language preparation is a cause for national shame; for 67,000 or 2 million children to be thus deprived is a national disgrace.

The effects of this word barrier extend beyond the 2 million children directly involved. Because of their inability to communicate effectively their classmates are often slowed down in the learning process. What appears to be an important but relatively small problem then, actually has tremendous magnitude and impact on untold millions of American children.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to establish a Bilingual Education Act to provide the assistance necessary to allow these children and their parents the opportunity to participate more fully in the life of America.

Although individual school districts have made efforts to meet the problems faced by non-English-speaking students in their classes, these efforts have rarely provided the comprehensive, concerted force needed to effect change. The Bilingual Education Act will provide this force.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9840

A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Bilingual Education Act."

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII, redesignating sections 701 through 706

and references thereto as sections 801 through 806, respectively, and by inserting after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$50,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education to assist them in carrying out bilingual education programs in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"Uses of Federal funds

"SEC. 702. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 703, for—

"(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to provide high-quality educational opportunities for children from non-English-speaking homes, including pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed and the development and dissemination of special instructional materials for use in bilingual education programs;

"(b) providing preservice training designed to prepare persons to participate in bilingual education programs as teachers or teacher-aides, and inservice training and development programs designed to enable such persons to continue to improve their qualifications while participating in such programs; and

"(c) the establishment, maintenance, and operation (including the construction, remodeling, or renovation, or acquisition by lease or otherwise, of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and instructional materials) of programs which are designed to upgrade the quality of the entire program of schools consisting of a large proportion of children from non-English-speaking low-income families or special programs designed to meet the educational needs of children in areas having high concentrations of children from non-English-speaking low-income families, including—

"(1) intensive early childhood programs involving bilingual education techniques designed to provide children during the preschool, kindergarten, and early elementary years with educational experiences which will enhance their learning potential;

"(2) special programs or projects designed to supplement and enrich the programs of elementary and secondary schools, including bilingual education programs and bicultural education programs which acquaint students from both English-speaking and non-English-speaking homes with the history and culture associated with each language;

"(3) comprehensive programs of supportive services to students, including guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, summer programs, psychological and social work services, health and nutrition programs, and efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and

"(4) adult education programs related to the purposes of this title, particularly for parents of children participating in bilingual programs.

"Approval of project applications

"SEC. 703. (a) A grant may be made under this title only for a project under clause (a) of section 702 or a project involving programs under both of clauses (b) and (c) of section 702, upon application submitted to the Commissioner jointly by a local educational agency and an institution of higher education, at such time or times, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such application shall—

"(1) provide that the local educational agency and the institution of higher education jointly submitting the application will be responsible for carrying out the programs for which assistance is sought under this title;

"(2) set forth procedures and policies which assure that the training provided by the institution of higher education for teachers and teacher-aides will be coordinated with the bilingual education programs of the local educational agency in which such persons are serving or will serve;

"(3) provide for such methods of administration as will best carry out the purposes of this title;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures which assure that the Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of assistance under this title, be made available by the applicant for the education of children served by programs assisted under this title, and in no case supplant such funds;

"(5) show the estimated total current educational expenditure per pupil participating in the programs for which assistance is sought under this title;

"(6) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title;

"(7) provide for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds expended for the purposes set forth in section 702 have been effective, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(8) provide assurance that, to the extent consistent with law, provision has been made for the participation in the project of non-English-speaking children who are not enrolled in public school on a full-time basis.

"(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—

"(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

"(2) the project set forth in the application is of such size, scope, quality and design as to provide reasonable assurance of making a substantial impact in meeting the special educational needs of persons who come from non-English-speaking low-income families; and

"(3) approval of the project is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner, including criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title and criteria designed to take into account the impact upon the educational programs in communities in which the number of non-English-speaking persons from low-income families constitutes a substantial proportion of the population.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Payments

"SEC. 704. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to each applicant which has an application for a project approved under this title such amounts as the applicant may expend under the terms of the grant, which may include an amount for development of the proposal of not to exceed one per centum of the grant in the first year of a project assisted under this title.

"(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by

way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 705. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

SEC. 3. (a) That part of section 801 (as so redesignated by section 2 of this Act) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which precedes clause (a) is amended by striking out "and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "V, and VII".

(b) Clause (j) of such 801 is amended by striking out "title II and title III," and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, and VII".

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, our senior citizens should be able to look upon the sunset of their lives with the assurance that they will not be darkened by the ugly shadow of poverty.

We in the Congress must take the necessary legislative steps to improve our social security system so that our senior citizens will have the assurance they so rightfully deserve that their retirement years will be lived in dignity and self-respect.

I have received a resolution from the Rhode Island chapter of the National Council of Senior Citizens requesting such action which I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION FOR SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Whereas, President Johnson has urged the Congress of the United States to increase Social Security benefits by an average of 20 percent with the biggest proportionate share going to the 2½ million retirees who now get only the minimum of \$44 a month (\$66 for a couple); and

Whereas, even the proposed increases would fall short of assuring Social Security beneficiaries genuine financial independence, as contemplated by the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, many other nations, far less affluent than the United States, have far more adequate social welfare systems; and

Whereas, no remotely comparable insurance protection is available to Americans at any price;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Congress of the United States take prompt, positive action to attack the deficiencies that exist in the Social Security system, so that older Americans, widows and children, and the disabled can live out their retirement years in

dignity and self-respect rather than in poverty and despair; and

Be it further resolved, since the program's biggest single defect is the lack of adequate cash benefits, that the Congress act to increase these benefits as proposed by the President; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator Pastore, Senator Pell, Congressman St Germain, Congressman Tiernan, and Chairman Wilbur Mills, requesting them to support the President's proposals, and to place this resolution in the records of Congress; and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be given the fullest publicity through the communications media.

RUMANIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, the national holiday of the Rumanian people is celebrated. On this day in 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania and the Rumanian dynasty was founded. Eleven years later, in 1877, the principality of Rumania severed her links with the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed her independence and on May 10, just 15 years after the founding of the Rumanian dynasty, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a most significant day for the Rumanian people and for the world because mankind has been greatly enriched by the many contributions made to it by this great nation. A nation, which we are sad to say, now stands beneath the dark shadow of communism.

Twenty-two years have passed since the independence of this spirited nation has been disrupted by the forces of communism but this passage of two decades has not destroyed the will of the Rumanian people to assert their sense of national pride and national independence. It still remains to pierce the shadow of communism with the bright light of hope and historic strength.

This spirit of nationalism is particularly significant when we view how it has managed to break the monolithic Soviet bloc into many factions of communism, some of which are opposed to each other. And the spirited light of nationalism shines brightest in Rumania. Someday I expect this spirit to overcome the darkness of communism and once again clearly place before the world the splendor of an independent Rumania.

EXPORT-IMPORT FIAT CASE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, too often immediate considerations cloud ultimate objectives and cause us to veer off course in our endeavor to gain a lasting world peace.

Such is the case concerning the authorization of the Export-Import Bank to grant a \$40 million credit to Italy's Fiat Co. in order to allow the company to purchase machine tools in the United States for a huge auto plant to be built in the Soviet Union.

Because of Russia's assistance to North Vietnam, an immediate consideration, too many people have failed to realize that the loan in question would provide for an increasing amount of the Soviet's industrial capacity to be geared to producing consumer goods, an ultimate objective.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert into the Record an editorial concerning this matter that appeared in the May 9 edition of the Providence Journal.

This article brings to light all the considerations of the case at hand and is as follows:

TOOLING UP

The House banking committee has acted in the nation's best interest by helping to establish what could be an important element in President Johnson's plan for improved East-West trade.

The committee narrowly rejected an amendment that would have barred the Export-Import Bank from granting a 40-million dollar credit to Italy's Fiat company in order to allow the company to purchase machine tools in the U.S. for a huge auto plant to be built in the Soviet Union.

The amendment had a political ring because, generally speaking, it would prohibit the bank from making loans or guaranteeing any loans for the use of any nation whose government is providing goods or services for an antagonist of the United States.

The Soviet Union happens to be helping North Vietnam in the Vietnam War, and the machine tool credit involved in the Fiat-Soviet auto plant would fall under this prohibition.

The House committee fortunately was guided by long-range and more valid considerations concerning U.S. security. It is to America's advantage and in the cause of world peace if an increasing amount of the Soviets' industrial capacity is geared to producing consumer goods. There also is important American self-interest in selling machine tools in what probably will be a rapidly growing market.

It is to be hoped that the entire House will see these advantages as clearly as did the majority of the banking committee and help to move along this important bit of liberal trade legislation.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the glories of an affluent society is its ability to combat poverty wherever and whenever it may exist.

Being cognizant of our ability to remove the ugly shadow of poverty from the face of our land, the Congress committed itself to this task by waging a war on poverty. Our commitment is a firm one. And it should be.

Therefore, it was with great delight that I listened to President Johnson's stirring words yesterday about the war on poverty.

It is clear that we are not backing off from our commitment to fight poverty—

He stated—

Nor will we—so long as I have anything to say about it.

We are staying for the long pull.

Continued the President.

These words embrace the tenacity that must be the very backbone of our antipoverty program. The President knows that victory in the war on poverty will not be easy to come by. He is aware of the strong political forces that threaten to destroy the war on poverty in favor of short-range political gain. But the President is determined that the war on poverty shall be won and he is willing to stick it out. And, I submit, so is this House and the rest of the Nation.

It would indeed be a tragedy for America, Mr. Speaker, if this body should fail to face up to the long pull and should fail in its commitment to our underprivileged citizens. And this is what would occur if the so-called Republican opportunity crusade were to be enacted. This "crusade" would abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity, the only voice the poor have ever had in the Halls of Government. It would scatter the antipoverty programs throughout the old bureaucracy to agencies whose heads have publicly warned that they are strained to the administrative breaking point by the programs they already have.

Much to my dismay, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the Office of Economic Opportunity and the President's war on poverty. Too many people have failed to realize that the war on poverty is not a matter of welfare or the dole. On the contrary, its aims are to abolish the dole by making productive members of society out of those welfare recipients who are not able to help themselves.

And there is another misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, to which the President alluded yesterday. That is the erroneous idea that the economic opportunity legislation is an exclusively Negro program.

Poverty wears different masks in different places—

The President wisely remarked—

We may sometimes think of it as a Negro affliction, but seven out of ten poor people are white.

I would like to emphasize for the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the war on poverty is a comprehensive program and a national program. It has the strong support of the President and of the Nation. It, therefore, deserves the strong support of this body.

PANAMA CANAL: BETRAYAL OF OUR TAXPAYERS' VAST INVESTMENT PROPOSED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since December 18, 1964, the governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama have been engaged in diplomatic negotiations for a new treaty to replace the treaty of 1903 under which Panama granted in perpetuity to the United States exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

In a joint statement by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on September 24, 1965, they announced that agreement had been reached on the following points:

First. That the 1903 treaty will be abrogated.

Second. That the new treaty will effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory—United States owned.

Third. That the new treaty will terminate after a specified number of years.

Fourth. That a primary objective of the new treaty will be to integrate the Canal Zone territory with that of the Republic of Panama.

The significance of that announcement was immediately apparent to informed Members of the Congress and students of the Isthmian question but not to the people of our country at large. It was evident that our negotiators with Panama had been bamboozled from start to finish by radical and communistic demands on the part of the Panamanian negotiators.

In a statement to the House and press release on September 27, 1965, I emphasized three points: First, that the Presidential declaration meant a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty with respect to the Panama Canal and Canal Zone in favor of a dual managerial and governmental setup, in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability; second, that such control could only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extraterritorial jurisdiction; and third, that it would mean the scrapping of all laws enacted by the Congress since 1904 for canal purposes and for governing the zone territory, with the loss of our huge investment. For full text of my press release see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30, 1965.

As a consequence, many Members of the Congress and others have wished to know the extent of our investment in the Panama Canal and Canal Zone territory, the funds for which have been furnished by our Nation's taxpayers. Since its total

sum apparently had never been determined, on August 30, 1966, I requested the Secretary of the Army to supply me such information. He has now replied in two reports: the first on April 10, 1967, concerning the costs to the Army, Navy, and Air Force for defending—military—the Panama Canal; and the second on April 21, 1967, concerning the costs of the acquisition and government of the Canal Zone and of the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and—police—protection of the canal.

From the data thus supplied, the following are the sums paid by our Government—an astounding total:

Defense of the Panama Canal:	
Army	\$2,874,361,000
Navy	853,190,000
Air Force	320,400,000
Total	4,047,951,000

Acquisition of government of the Canal Zone, construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection (police) of the Panama Canal:	
Gross U.S. investment	1,951,600,000
Recoveries by U.S. Treasury	1,251,500,000
Unrecovered	700,100,000
Total Investment	4,748,051,000

This is exclusive of \$141,000,000 of net revenue which if added would bring our total investment to \$4,889,051,000.

In connection with the gross U.S. investment of \$1,951,600,000, this figure does not accurately reflect its present value, which, conservatively speaking, would be anywhere from 100 to 200 percent more than the sum stated.

Mr. Speaker, this total book value of \$4,748,051,000 is greater than I expected and this is the investment that our country will altogether lose by the currently proposed treaty or treaties that may be sent to the Senate at any time after July for ratification—a shocking assault on the taxpayers of our country. Moreover, the proposed treaties if ratified will constitute an ignoring of American taxpayers who, in the canal picture, constitute a group that has been entirely ignored and forgotten.

No wonder the hidden architects of this planned surrender are using the treaty process to bring about what could never be obtained by legislation. No wonder they are strenuously endeavoring to keep the current diplomatic negotiations secret and to maintain silence in the Senate until the treaties are sprung on an uninformed body with the evident purpose to obtain a stampeded ratification.

In connection with the last, one of the key officials concerned with the treaty negotiations, a Presidential appointee, has visited Capitol Hill, talked with a number of prominent Senators, and endeavored to persuade them to remain silent until after the treaties are submitted. Could there be anything more iniquitous than to discourage Senators from studying this vital matter in advance of submission of the treaties? Could there be anything more ruinous of our constitutional system of separation

of powers? And could there be a more atrocious disregard of our citizens who have furnished the huge funds thus to be given away as if they amount to no more than a pinch of salt?

In order that the entire Nation may have the facts and figures of our investment at Panama and with the hope that in some way the taxpayers will come to understand the situation involved, I quote my initial request to the Secretary of the Army and his two reports as parts of my remarks; and commend them for study by every Member of the Congress, the staffs of cognizant committees, interested agencies in the executive branch of our Government, and all others concerned with the isthmian question, especially transportation agencies, institutions of learning, and those responsible for mass media dissemination.

The information follows:

August 30, 1966.

Hon. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary, Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the importance of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal problems now pending and in furtherance of studies that I have made through the years in these connections, I desire, as early as may be practicable, a statement showing all sums paid by our government and its subsidiaries for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, protection and defense of the Canal and the government of the Canal Zone, starting in 1904 and continuing until the present time.

Such statement should include any interest that our government had paid on the account of expenditures dealing with the Zone and the Canal, including expenditures by the Panama Canal Company; and for all bridges, roadways, hospitals, residences and other improvements in the Zone made at the expense of the United States, together with the costs of fortifications in and out of the Canal Zone. Such gross sums of expenditures should be credited respectively by any sums of reimbursements received by our government and its agencies.

In brief, I should like to have a complete chronological recital of all and expenditures and credits so as to show, at least in approximation, what has been thus expended, in net, in the activities.

I realize that this request may involve considerable research, but I believe that under existing conditions such data is imperative.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is in response to your letters of August 30, 1966 and February 21, 1967 to Secretary Resor requesting information on the sums paid by our Government and its subsidiaries for the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, protection and defense of the Panama Canal and the Government of the Canal Zone.

The enclosure attached provides cost data relating to the protection and defense of the Canal in a chronological display as requested. You will note that this data covers all identifiable expenditures of the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The remaining data requested will be provided shortly.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS HOLT,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army,
(International Affairs).

COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL BY MILITARY DEPARTMENT
Cost of defense and protection of the Panama Canal

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Army	Navy	USAF	Total
1904	7	292	0	1,299
1905	16	67	0	83
1906	14	145	0	159
1907	22	234	0	256
1908	36	150	0	186
1909	50	203	0	253
1910	43	214	0	257
1911	1,652	206	0	1,858
1912	1,590	314	0	1,904
1913	3,052	339	0	3,391
1914	6,996	183	0	7,179
1915	5,610	782	0	6,392
1916	14,462	782	0	15,244
1917	21,122	967	0	22,079
1918	18,784	182	0	18,966
1919	15,764	1,262	0	17,026
1920	15,926	1,262	0	17,188
1921	20,101	1,337	0	21,438
1922	27,536	1,172	0	28,708
1923	28,536	1,156	0	29,692
1924	28,036	1,165	0	29,201
1925	27,786	1,355	0	29,141
1926	29,013	1,230	0	30,243
1927	29,013	1,210	0	30,223
1928	30,013	1,751	0	31,764
1929	29,013	2,195	0	31,208
1930	29,013	3,811	0	32,824
1931	30,704	5,809	0	36,513
1932	30,704	6,982	0	37,686
1933	31,704	6,798	0	38,502
1934	31,599	2,617	0	34,216
1935	49,951	2,571	0	46,522
1936	41,969	3,500	0	45,469
1937	43,547	4,080	0	47,627
1938	51,744	3,825	0	55,569
1939	46,029	3,878	0	49,907
1940	75,146	4,740	0	79,886
1941	119,437	12,508	0	131,945
1942	197,255	26,277	0	223,532
1943	194,067	66,784	0	260,851
1944	140,442	87,360	0	227,802
1945	108,435	84,000	0	192,435
1946	60,101	51,830	0	111,931
1947	54,189	35,572	8,605	98,366
1948	30,113	35,400	8,605	74,118
1949	41,058	27,492	8,605	77,155
1950	49,019	21,139	8,605	78,763
1951	58,729	19,456	5,834	84,019
1952	72,204	26,398	7,568	106,170
1953	60,207	24,880	9,144	94,231
1954	54,582	23,318	9,854	87,754
1955	64,531	19,384	10,031	93,946
1956	49,182	26,700	10,817	86,699
1957	51,356	15,600	11,810	78,766
1958	36,783	12,460	11,209	60,452
1959	41,220	10,206	11,459	62,885
1960	51,408	9,817	11,102	72,327
1961	56,413	10,325	11,437	78,175
1962	58,789	10,387	12,066	81,242
1963	68,256	11,032	13,944	93,232
1964	77,955	10,253	20,610	108,818
1965	75,872	10,717	27,423	114,012
1966	76,742	11,590	29,914	118,246
MCA total	115,723	83,849	72,258	*271,830
Total	2,874,361	853,190	320,400	4,047,951

* Total estimated expenditures include appropriations for military personnel, operation and maintenance, and procurement of equipment and missiles (including replacement of equipment and ammunition).

* MCA (military construction, appropriations) have not been itemized by year. This total represents all sums expended for military construction, including housing, for all military departments from 1904 to June 30, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, ESTIMATED COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by the Comptroller of the Army.

1. The report contains a chronological listing by major appropriation of the estimated expenditures of the US Army from 1904 to 30 June 1966.

2. Format of the report is as follows:

Column 1: Year.

Column 2: Military Strength of the Army as of 30 June, each year.

Column 3: MPA (Military Personnel, Army) Appropriation.

Column 4: OMA (Operation and Maintenance, Army) Appropriation.

Column 5: PEMA (Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army) Appropriation.

(Includes PEMA Replacement and Ammunition).

Column 6: MCA (Military Construction, Army) Appropriation.

Column 7: Total Expenditures, rounded to the nearest thousand dollars.

Cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength	MPA	OMA	PEMA	MCA	Total	Year	Military strength	MPA	OMA	PEMA	MCA	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1904	14	\$4	\$3	0	(9)	\$7	1937	13,243	\$23,745	\$18,996	\$806		\$43,547
1905	9	9	7	0		16	1938	14,942	26,791	21,433	3,520		51,744
1906	8	8	6	0		14	1939	13,451	24,118	19,294	2,617		46,029
1907	13	12	10	0		22	1940	22,384	40,135	32,108	2,903		75,146
1908	21	20	16	0		36	1941	35,017	62,785	50,228	6,424		119,437
1909	29	28	22	0		50	1942	58,257	104,455	83,564	9,236		197,255
1910	25	24	19	0		43	1943	57,805	102,748	82,198	9,121		194,067
1911	876	841	673	\$138		1,652	1944	41,278	74,011	59,200	7,222		140,442
1912	841	807	646	137		1,590	1945	32,018	57,408	45,926	5,101		108,435
1913	886	851	681	1,520		3,052	1946	14,704	33,569	23,526	3,006		60,101
1914	2,179	2,092	1,674	3,230		6,996	1947	13,821	27,794	23,496	2,899		54,189
1915	3,000	2,880	2,304	426		5,610	1948	7,251	14,763	13,777	1,573		30,113
1916	8,000	7,680	6,144	628		14,452	1949	7,682	23,300	16,132	1,626		44,048
1917	11,222	10,773	8,618	1,731		21,122	1950	8,343	26,247	18,772	4,000		49,019
1918	10,461	10,043	8,034	707		18,784	1951	8,424	33,890	20,807	4,032		58,729
1919	4,722	8,467	6,774	523		15,764	1952	11,671	37,125	29,761	5,318		72,204
1920	4,772	8,556	6,845	525		15,926	1953	9,960	29,083	26,484	4,640		62,207
1921	6,053	10,853	8,682	566		20,101	1954	8,146	26,963	23,697	3,922		54,582
1922	8,334	14,943	11,954	639		27,536	1955	9,360	32,610	27,518	4,403		64,531
1923	8,334	14,943	11,954	1,639		28,536	1956	6,808	25,305	20,485	3,392		49,182
1924	8,334	14,943	11,954	1,139		28,036	1957	6,934	26,585	21,329	3,442		51,356
1925	8,334	14,943	11,954	889		27,786	1958	4,825	18,750	15,426	2,607		36,783
1926	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013	1959	4,859	21,312	17,288	2,620		41,220
1927	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013	1960	5,930	26,359	21,075	3,974		51,408
1928	8,784	15,750	12,600	1,663		30,103	1961	6,444	28,940	23,295	4,178		56,413
1929	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013	1962	6,699	30,025	22,485	4,279		58,789
1930	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013	1963	7,735	30,419	28,148	4,689		63,256
1931	9,303	16,680	13,344	680		30,704	1964	8,557	41,288	31,652	5,015		77,955
1932	9,303	16,680	13,344	680		30,704	1965	8,245	39,436	31,545	4,891		75,872
1933	9,303	16,680	13,344	1,680		31,704	1966	8,313	39,902	31,922	4,918		76,742
1934	9,578	17,173	13,738	688		31,599	MCA total						115,723
1935	13,367	23,967	19,174	810		43,951	Total	656,596	1,451,388	1,156,796	150,454	\$115,723	2,874,361
1936	12,750	22,877	18,302	790		41,969							

¹ The 1st U.S. military garrison in the Canal Zone consisted of approximately 1,400 U.S. Marine Corps personnel that were landed in November 1903 and departed in January 1914. Army personnel during the period 1904-10 consisted primarily of survey teams. The 1st U.S. Army troop unit arrived in the Canal Zone October 1911.

² Original Army fortifications (1911-15) cost approximately \$11,000,000. Construction just prior to and during World War II cost approximately \$75,000,000. Remainder is for roads and other required military construction. Does not include minor construction projects which are funded under "Operation and maintenance," Army. Does not include defense expenditures such as bombproofing locks which were funded by the Panama Canal Company.

³ Plans for early defense of the canal had their beginning in January 1913. At this time a House committee on appropriations held open hearings on the defenses to be constructed. It was estimated that a minimum mobile force of 7,000 troops plus the coast artillery personnel to man the planned heavy fortifications would be required. The study resulted in the Department of the Army being authorized a total of 8,350 military personnel for the protection and defense of the Canal Zone. It is interesting to note that the present day Army strength in the Canal Zone is very close to this figure. The Panama Canal Department has undergone many reorganizations since

this early defense plan was implemented; however, the major changes in Army units are that the Hawk batteries have replaced the coast artillery batteries and an infantry brigade along with a Special Forces Group have replaced the infantry regiments and other mobile forces of that era.

⁴ The 1st Air Corps units were assigned to the Panama Canal Department in 1919. During this period the Army coast defenses and the mobile defenses consisted of 18 coast artillery batteries, 3 infantry regiments, 1 cavalry squadron, 1 field artillery battalion, 1 signal company, 1 engineer regiment, 2 observation groups (Air Corps), and 1 photographic section (Air Corps).

⁵ Sources: Annual reports of the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, or the Adjutant General, Chief, Military History, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Chief of Inter-oceanic Canal Studies, Office of the Chief of Engineers, and the Comptroller of the Army.

Historical references: History of the Panama Canal Department, vol. I-IV, An Integrated History of Panama Canal Department and the Fortifications of the Panama Canal. (Historical manuscripts are on file in the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY ESTIMATED COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

FOREWORD

1. This report presents estimated net expenditures in cases where complete fiscal data were not available. Estimates are based on historical records.

2. Military construction costs for the Navy Department are in the summary for all Services in Enclosure 1.

Estimated cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength (man-years) ¹	Military pay	All other costs	Total costs ²
1904	946	\$287	\$5	\$292
1905	203	66	1	67
1906	417	142	3	145
1907	675	230	4	234
1908	415	144	6	150
1909	415	194	9	203
1910	415	204	10	214
1911	415	197	9	206
1912	415	265	49	314
1913	415	270	69	339
1914	27	101	82	183
1915	(9)	96	686	782
1916	(9)	96	861	957
1917	(9)	96	86	182
1918	(9)	170	1,092	1,262
1919	(9)	170	1,092	1,262
1920	(9)	170	1,167	1,337
1921	(9)	170	1,002	1,172
1922	(9)	170	1,002	1,172
1923	52	212	944	1,156

Estimated cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength (man-years) ¹	Military pay	All other costs	Total costs ²
1924	62	\$221	\$944	\$1,165
1925	65	221	1,134	1,355
1926	66	246	884	1,230
1927	64	400	810	1,210
1928	62	807	944	1,751
1929	64	1,131	1,064	2,195
1930	72	1,555	2,256	3,811
1931	83	1,908	3,901	5,809
1932	97	2,262	4,720	6,982
1933	85	2,216	4,582	6,798
1934	85	1,750	867	2,617
1935	82	1,751	820	2,571
1936	93	1,771	1,729	3,500
1937	144	1,839	2,241	4,080
1938	150	1,826	1,999	3,825
1939	174	2,336	1,542	3,878
1940	220	2,518	2,222	4,740
1941	2,043	3,961	8,547	12,508
1942	5,674	6,259	20,018	26,277
1943	10,810	14,454	52,330	66,784
1944	10,172	13,133	74,227	87,360
1945	9,546	15,819	68,181	84,000
1946	3,835	13,723	38,107	51,830
1947	3,280	9,720	25,852	35,572
1948	2,455	6,478	28,922	35,400
1949	2,968	7,989	19,503	27,492
1950	1,262	3,550	17,589	21,399
1951	1,440	4,740	14,716	19,456
1952	1,467	4,679	21,719	26,398
1953	1,563	5,391	19,189	24,580
1954	1,474	3,945	19,373	23,318
1955	1,194	4,157	15,227	19,384
1956	1,193	4,209	22,491	26,700
1957	984	3,750	11,850	15,600
1958	650	2,511	9,949	12,460

Estimated cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength (man-years) ¹	Military pay	All other costs	Total costs ²
1959	615	\$2,577	\$7,629	\$10,206
1960	526	2,232	7,585	9,817
1961	544	2,348	7,977	10,325
1962	530	2,290	8,097	10,387
1963	577	2,522	8,510	11,032
1964	592	2,845	7,408	10,253
1965	639	3,197	7,520	10,717
1966	639	3,225	8,365	11,590
Total	73,150	177,938	591,403	769,341

¹ Man-year data prior to 1941 cover Marine Corps personnel only. Military pay is for Marine Corps only in 1904 through 1907 but for Navy and Marine Corps personnel beginning in 1908. Navy man-year data are not available 1908 through 1940.

² Excludes \$83,849,000 for military construction, Navy expenditures from 1904-66, as provided by the Chief of Inter-oceanic Canal Studies, Office of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army.

³ Not available.

⁴ Total for col. 2 is military man-years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, ESTIMATED COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

FOREWORD

1. The data shown therefore reflect costs of the U.S. Air Force Southern Command (formerly the Caribbean Air Command), and to the extent possible excludes those costs

related to various Latin American programs such as missions. Also excluded are those expenses not financed through or identified with this command or its bases, such as Aircraft POL and centrally procured items purchased through procurement appropriations. Of the costs presented, the funds related to that specific mission of the command which is "to direct the Air Defense of the Canal Zone" cannot be separately identified.

2. Expenditures for the Army Air Corps (prior to 1947) are included in Army costs. *Air Force expenses in Panama Canal Zone*

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Fiscal year	Military personnel		Operation and maintenance	Military construction	Total
	Number	Amount			
1947 ¹	3,213	\$5,552	\$3,053	-----	\$8,605
1948 ¹	3,213	5,552	3,053	-----	8,605
1949 ¹	3,213	5,552	3,053	-----	8,605
1950 ¹	3,213	5,552	3,053	-----	8,605
1951	1,328	2,548	3,286	-----	5,834
1952	1,781	2,548	3,814	-----	7,563
1953	1,994	5,659	3,485	-----	9,144
1954	1,789	5,807	4,047	-----	9,854
1955	1,604	5,546	4,485	-----	10,031
1956	1,547	5,705	5,112	-----	10,817
1957	1,411	5,385	5,925	-----	11,310
1958	1,282	5,113	6,096	-----	11,209
1959	1,252	5,353	6,106	-----	11,459
1960	1,207	5,026	6,076	-----	11,102
1961	1,144	5,037	6,400	-----	11,437
1962	1,139	5,346	6,720	-----	12,066
1963	1,173	5,357	8,587	-----	13,944
1964	1,736	8,776	11,834	-----	20,610
1965	2,312	12,545	14,878	-----	27,423
1966	2,469	14,678	15,236	-----	29,914
MCA total ²	-----	-----	-----	\$72,258	72,258
Total	38,020	123,843	124,299	72,258	320,400

¹ Estimated for 1947-49.

² MCA total is for 1947-66. Includes \$62,157 originally appropriated for Army MCA and transferred when the U.S. Air Force became a separate department.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1967.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In my letter of April 10, 1967 I submitted to you cost data relating to the protection and defense of the Panama Canal. This was in partial response to your requests for information in letters of August 30, 1966 and February 21, 1967 to Secretary Resor.

The remaining investment of the United States Government in the Canal is reflected in the enclosure attached. These same data were submitted for the record to the Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works as an extension of the testimony by the Governor of the Canal Zone at a hearing on April 11, 1967.

If I can be of further assistance to you on this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS HOLT,

Deputy Under Secretary of the Army
(International Affairs).

PANAMA CANAL ENTERPRISE

Unaudited summary of funds and property received by the Panama Canal enterprise from the U.S. Government, interest costs thereon payable to the U.S. Government, and funds paid back to the U.S. Treasury by the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	July 1, 1951	June 30, 1966
Gross investment of U.S. Government:		
Funds and property transfers (1).....	1,013.9	1,418.8
Interest on net investment of U.S. Government:		
From inception to June 30, 1951 (2).....	373.4	373.4

PANAMA CANAL ENTERPRISE—Continued

Unaudited summary of funds and property received by the Panama Canal enterprise from the U.S. Government, interest costs thereon payable to the U.S. Government, and funds paid back to the U.S. Treasury by the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	July 1, 1951	June 30, 1966
Gross investment of U.S. Government—Continued		
Interest on net investment of U.S. Government—Con.		
From July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1966:		
Panama Canal Company (paid to U.S. Treasury) (3).....		139.6
Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge (4).....		18.8
Total gross investment of U.S. Government.....	1,387.3	1,951.6
Recoveries by the U.S. Treasury:		
Deposits and deposit credits from all sources (5).....	784.6	1,251.5
Unrecovered balance excluding retained earnings.....	602.7	700.1

NOTE.—Not included above is \$141,000,000 of net revenue (carried over from Panama Railroad Company, \$71,000,000 plus \$70,000,000 accrued to Panama Canal Company since July 1, 1951). If this amount is to be considered as an added investment it should be added to the cash total above, as follows:

	1951	1966
Total as above.....	602.7	700.1
Retained net revenue.....	71.1	141.1
Adjusted total.....	673.8	841.2

Detailed statement supporting summary statement of unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966

1. Funds and property transfers:	
Funds appropriated directly for the enterprise:	
Original construction.....	\$386,910,301.00
Maintenance, operation, and additional capital expenditures.....	929,593,859.40
Total.....	1,316,504,160.40

Funds appropriated for other U.S. Government agencies for the direct benefit of the enterprise:	
Construction annuity to employees (and their widows) engaged in the construction of the canal.....	45,672,877.91
Increased annuity to Panama.....	16,500,000.00
Annuities to employees retired prior to July 1, 1951.....	15,091,000.00
Salaries of military personnel assigned to the canal prior to July 1, 1951.....	9,307,002.00
Injury and death payments, Bureau of Employees Compensation.....	4,704,700.17
Total.....	91,275,580.62
Total appropriations.....	1,407,779,741.02

Detailed statement supporting summary statement of unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966—Continued

1. Funds, etc.—Continued	
Property transferred from other U.S. Government agencies.....	\$19,395,443.22
Property transferred to other U.S. Government agencies.....	7,354,372.75
Total property transfers, net.....	12,041,070.47
Total funds and property transfers.....	1,419,820,811.49

FROM INCEPTION TO JUNE 30, 1951

2. Interest on net direct investment:	
Interest at 3 percent to Aug. 14, 1914, and at individual annual rates thereafter (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury), has been calculated on net withdrawals (total appropriations less deposits of canal tolls and other deposits) from 1904 to 1951).....	373,442,987.50

FROM JULY 1, 1951, TO JUNE 30, 1966

3. Panama Canal Company:	
Interest at rates from 1.95 percent for fiscal year 1951 to 3.63 percent for fiscal year 1966 (as determined by the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury) has been calculated on the Company's net direct investment, established in accordance with section 62 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, charged to Company operations and subsequently deposited into the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as required by law.....	139,586,357.35

4. Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge:	
Existing law specifically exempts the net direct investment of the Canal Zone Government and the Thatcher Ferry Bridge from interest charges. However, it is considered that this element should be included in arriving at the unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the canal enterprise. The interest cost reflected herein has been calculated at the same rates used for the Company as shown un-	

Detailed statement supporting summary statement of unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966—Continued

4. Canal Zone, etc.—Con.	
der paragraph 3 above, on the net direct investment of the Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge as of June 30 each year through June 30, 1966—	\$18,847,860.00
5. Recoveries by the U.S. Government:	
(a) Actual deposits into the U.S. Treasury:	
Canal tolls prior to June 30, 1951—	643,883,520.78
Net profits from business operations (activities corresponding roughly to our present supporting operations—	28,591,812.05
Licenses, fines, fees and postal receipts—	6,887,294.59
Proceeds from sale of construction equipment—	6,990,681.75
Capital repayments and interest on public works in Panama and Colon—	3,547,006.22
Dividends paid by the Panama Railroad from 1905 to 1950—	23,994,905.00
Interest on net direct investment of the Company from July 1, 1951 to date—	139,586,357.35
Capital repayments from July 1, 1951 to date—	25,000,000.00
Net cost of Canal Zone Government, reimbursed by the Panama Canal Company—	192,533,569.49
Canal Zone Government revenue and plant salvage—	109,821,007.64
Total—	1,180,836,154.87
(b) Deposit credits:	
Value of Canal tolls on U.S. Government vessels to June 30, 1951—	70,668,969.00
Total deposits and deposit credits—	1,251,505,123.87

JOB CORPS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should

like to bring to the attention of the House an up-to-date report on an important part the Job Corps is playing in each of our States, regardless of whether or not we each happen to have a Job Corps Center in our congressional district.

Job Corpsmen are sending home money to their dependents in the form of allotments—this act in itself is commendable. It is the beginning of responsibility that will have an influence on them the rest of their lives.

Under unanimous consent I include a report the Office of Economic Opportunity recently compiled showing that Job Corpsmen have spent home nearly \$16 million in allotments in the last 2 years.

The Job Corps report follows:

JOB CORPS ALLOTMENTS TO NEEDY DEPENDENTS TOTAL NEARLY \$16 MILLION

Job Corpsmen and women in two years have sent nearly \$16 million in allotments home to needy dependents, Director William P. Kelly of Job Corps announced today.

In March 1967, he said, 75 percent of the young men and women in the program made allotments to needy dependents. The allotments by 24,581 young men and women totaled \$1,211,910 that month.

Kelly said that 96.4 percent of those making allotments send the maximum of \$25 a month, with Job Corps matching the amount of the allotment.

The share of the allotment by the Corpsman or woman is taken from the \$50 a month readjustment allowance, which is paid the youth on leaving the program.

The first allotments were paid in March 1965 and the monthly total has increased steadily since that time, running at the rate of more than \$1 million a month since November 1966.

"It is heartening to see the great number of young people who willingly make these allotments, even though it comes in part out of their own funds," Kelly said. "These allotment payments are of great help to thousands of families in America, as well as thousands of communities."

Allotments paid from March 1965 through March 1967 by states:

Job Corps allotments

Alabama	\$721,887
Alaska	26,800
Arizona	138,380
Arkansas	511,150
California	1,057,410
Colorado	251,070
Connecticut	66,670
Delaware	70,730
District of Columbia	161,520
Florida	693,860
Georgia	746,310
Hawaii	98,600
Idaho	40,860
Illinois	496,070
Indiana	168,020
Iowa	48,890
Kansas	124,370
Kentucky	375,590
Louisiana	698,400
Maine	78,360
Maryland	327,740
Massachusetts	143,550
Michigan	262,180
Minnesota	97,450
Mississippi	592,140
Missouri	368,040
Montana	48,860
Nebraska	64,220
Nevada	41,090
New Hampshire	22,300
New Jersey	418,810
New Mexico	201,520
New York	1,086,390
North Carolina	292,350
North Dakota	52,250

Job Corps allotments—Continued

Ohio	\$405,260
Oklahoma	243,760
Oregon	110,200
Pennsylvania	438,200
Rhode Island	20,830
South Carolina	581,400
South Dakota	62,370
Tennessee	404,940
Texas	1,668,720
Utah	63,770
Vermont	18,940
Virginia	743,350
Washington	125,690
West Virginia	365,620
Wisconsin	95,240
Wyoming	36,920
Total	15,957,095

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MULTER, for 1 hour, on Monday, May 15, on the 19th anniversary of the independence of Israel.

Mr. ESCH (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) for 1 hour, on June 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. ROBINO.

Mr. KEE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 223. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 449. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 477. An act for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 645. An act to provide needed means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1136. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1190. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1411. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3979. A bill to amend section 6409(b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General;

with amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9833. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9834. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9835. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9837. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1959, as it relates to transportation expenses of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 9838. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9839. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain

meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9840. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself, and Mr. UTT):

H. Res. 470. A resolution commending San Diego, Calif., for its commemoration of Charles A. Lindbergh's historic transatlantic flight in the Spirit of St. Louis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9841. A bill for the relief of Giacomo and Vincenza Bologna and minor child, Pasquale Bologna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9842. A bill for the relief of Nina Gemma Sinagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9843. A bill for the relief of Luciana Ernesto Rodriguez DeCastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

80. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors, county of Santa Barbara, Calif., relative to the establishment of an oil drilling sanctuary offshore of the city of Santa Barbara, and to establish a moratorium for 1 year on oil leasing in the Santa Barbara Channel, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the national holiday of the Rumanian people, celebrated by Rumanian organizations throughout the world. After centuries of oppressive domination by the Ottoman Empire, the Rumanian people had at long last achieved their much desired freedom and nation independence. Today marks the 90th anniversary of that event.

Unfortunately, the Rumanian people today live in a state of national oppression, victims of the vile infection of communism. Rumania along with many of her Eastern European counterparts was swallowed up by the tyranny of communism following World War II.

Let us all express a common wish that the forces of Rumanian unity with the West will increase and that in the course of time the Rumanian people will enjoy the national independence they so richly

deserve. Today we join with Rumanians who are captive in their homeland in hoping for the dawn of a new time, when freedom will return to their country.

Rumanian National Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, we commemorate the anniversary of the proclamation of Rumanian independence. On this date, in 1877, the Rumanian Parliament declared Rumania totally independent of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, after having endured centuries of persecution, oppression, and hardship. In 1856 Rumania had secured a status of autonomy from the Turks who by then had begun to feel the symptoms of decline. Even so, the Ottomans exacted an annual tribute from the Rumanians.

Ten years later, Rumanians elected as prince, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sig-

maringen; at the same time a new constitution was instituted to which Prince Charles subscribed. This constitution was based on the Belgium Charter of 1851 and provided for upper and lower legislative bodies and gave the prince an unconditional veto on all legislation.

The existence of the Turkish tribute served to overburden the economic and social system of Rumania. When the Russo-Turkish War broke out in 1877, Rumanians were overjoyed. They were confident that Russia would crush Turkey, gain for Rumania complete freedom from Turkey, and at the same time, respect Rumania's territorial integrity. Thus, it was that on May 10, 1877, the Parliament passed the resolution declaring Rumania's independence from Turkey, gain for Rumania complete freedom by the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, albeit with certain harsh territorial encroachments, to the benefit of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to salute the Rumanian people and their perseverance and courage in attaining independence from outside domination. It is our firm belief that Rumanians will persevere still in their struggles against outside domination and will one day soon take their proper position on the world stage of free nations.